

The Gazette



of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 3] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JANUARY 19, 1963/PAUSA 29, 1884

## NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 9th January 1963:—

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
1	S. O. 50, dated 4th January, 1963.	Ministry of Law	Appointing the fourth day of January, 1963 as the date on which the provisions of Section 32 and Chapter VI of the Advocates Act, 1961 (25 of 1961) shall come into force.
2	S. O. 51, dated 8th January, 1963.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.
	S.O. 52, dated 8th January, 1963.	Ditto.	Corrigenda to S. O. No. 3489, dated 16th November, 1962 and S. O. No. 3857, dated 22nd December, 1962.
3	S. O. 115, dated 9th January, 1963.	Ministry of Finance	Constituting the Gold Board and appointing the members.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

## PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

## ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 5th January 1963

**S.O. 133.**—It is hereby notified for general information that the disqualification under clause (c) of section 7 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, incurred by the person whose name and address are given below, has been removed by the

Election Commission in exercise of the powers conferred on it by the said clause and section of the said Act:—

#### SCHEDULE

Name and address of the disqualified candidate	Serial No. and name of constituency	Commission's notification No. and date under which disqualified
1	2	3
Shri Sabna Dehri, Village Amirjola, P.O. Amrapara, Santhal Parganas, Bihar.	24. Rajmahal	BR-P/24/62(27), dated the 22nd May, 1962.

[No. BR-P/24/62(27-R)/417.]

*New Delhi, the 9th January 1963*

**S.O. 134.**—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the order pronounced on the 18th December, 1962, by the Election Tribunal, Imphal.

#### IN THE COURT OF THE ELECTION TRIBUNAL, MANIPUR (DISTRICT JUDGE, MANIPUR)

#### ELECTION PETITION No. 4 OF 1962.

(Election Petition No. 341 of '62 as entered in the Order Sheet of Election Commission of India).

**Sri Sibbo Larho of Punanamel, P.O. Mao, Manipur—Petitioner.**

**Vs.**

1. Sri Rishang of village Bongpa Khunou, P.O. Chasat, Manipur.
2. Sri Vungkhom of village Hianglam Lamka, P.O. Churachandpur, Manipur.
3. Sri Chungkhokhal Doungal of village Bongmol, P.O. Kangpokpi, Manipur.
4. Sri T. Gougin, P.O. Churachandpur, Manipur.—*Respondents.*

#### PRESIDENT:

Sri M. H. Khan, District Judge, Manipur, (Member, Election Tribunal).

*For the Petitioner:*—1. Sri T. Bhubon Singh, Advocate,  
and

2. Sri R. K. Jhalajit Singh, Advocate

*For the Respondents:*—1. Sri R. K. Maulsana Singh, Advocate,  
and

2. Sri R. K. Dorendra Singh, Pleader.

*Dated, Imphal, the 18th December 1962.*

#### JUDGEMENT

(1) During the last general election (of 1962) there was a contest between five candidates for Outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency in the State of Manipur. The poll for the aforesaid Outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency had taken place on 19th, 23rd, and 27th February, and 6th March, 1962.

(2) The counting of vote was done on 11th and 12th March, 1962 and on a representation made by one of the candidates recounting in respect of some polling stations was made on 14th March, 1962. Thereafter the result was announced on the same day i.e. 14-3-62. Sri Rishang (respondent No. 1) was declared elected.

(3) The names of candidates with their symbols and the votes polled are as under:—

<i>Name of candidate</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>No. of valid votes polled</i>
1. Sri Sibo Larho (Petitioner)	Two bullocks with yoke on	35,579
2. Sri Rishang (Respdt. No. 1)	Tree	35,621
3. Sri Vungkhom (Respdt. No. 2)	Two leaves	18,898
4. Sri Chungkhokai Doungel (Respdt. No. 3)	Bicycle	15,927
5. Sri T. Gougin (Respdt. No. 4)	Scale	13,305
Total No. of valid votes polled		1,19,330

(4) The differences of votes polled between the petitioner (Sri Sibo Larho) and respondent No. 1 (Sri Rishang) was only of 42 votes.

(5) Sri Sibo Larho has filed the present petition challenging the election of Sri Rishang. His case is that gross illegality was committed in the counting of votes of two ballot boxes relating polling station No. 21×21 (Shingtom). At the time of counting of votes in respect of this polling station on one ballot box the outer symbol was found to be of scale and the inner symbol of tree, and on another box the outer symbol was found to be of tree and the inner symbol of scale. A protest was made about it, but inspite of it the Returning Officer got the votes of these boxes counted according to the outer symbol and not according to the inner symbol as required by the rules.

(6) It is alleged that in one of these boxes there were 345 votes and they were counted in favour of Sri Rishang (Respondent No. 1). In the other box there were 219 votes and these were counted in favour of Sri Gougin (Respondent No. 4). This counting was done according to the outer symbol, which was illegal. It should have been done according to the inner symbol, and in that case 345 votes should have been counted in favour of respondent No. 4 and 219 votes in favour of respondent No. 1. This would have made a difference of 126 votes in the total number of votes polled by respondent No. 1 and his total of 35,621 would have been reduced to 25,497. The total votes polled by the petitioner was 35,579. As such the petitioner should have been declared duly elected and not the respondent No. 1 had the counting of the aforesaid 2 ballot boxes been done according to law.

(7) It was prayed that the election of respondent No. 1 be declared as void and in its place the petitioner be declared as duly elected. In the alternative a fresh counting of ballot papers of polling station No. 21×21 (Shingtom) be ordered and the result of the election be reviewed in the light of the result of the fresh counting. It was further prayed that the election of respondent No. 1 be declared as void and re-election be ordered in case the Tribunal did not accept the first two prayers. The last prayer is that the respondent No. 1 be ordered to pay the cost of the petitioner.

(8) All the four respondents were duly served but only respondent No. 1 and respondent No. 4 filed their separate written statements in this case. Respondent No. 4 supported the claim of the petitioner in his written statement, and thereafter did not participate in the proceedings.

(9) Respondent No. 1 contested the petition. It was denied that any difference was found on any ballot box regarding its outer and inner symbols concerning polling station No. 21×21 (Shingtom). It was also denied that any protest was made about it or that there ever arose any occasion for the Returning Officer to decide that the counting of any ballot box be done on the basis of outer symbol. It was contended that there was no illegality or irregularity in the counting of votes in respect of any ballot box and as such the petition is liable to be dismissed with cost.

(10) It was further alleged that the deposit made by the petitioner was not in accordance with the Representation of People's Act of 1951 and the petition was also defective for non joinder of the Returning Officer, who was a necessary party because of the assertion of illegality and irregularity to have been committed in respect of the counting of votes

(11) After getting the pleadings cleared by recording the statements of petitioner and respondent No 1 together with their counsel, the following issues were framed —

- 1 (a) Whether at the time of counting of votes of Shingtom polling station any ballot box was found on which outer symbol of Tree and inner symbol of scale was affixed as alleged?
- (b) Did it contain 345 votes and all these votes were counted in favour of Respondent No 1?
- 2 (a) Whether at the time of counting of votes of Shingtom polling station any other ballot box was found on which outer symbol of scale and inner symbol of tree was affixed as alleged?
- (b) Did it contain 219 votes and all these votes were counted in favour of Respondent No 4?
- 3 Should under the Rules votes of the first box been counted in favour of Respondent No 4, and that of the second box in favour of Respondent No 1 as alleged?
- 4 Was any illegality committed in counting of votes as alleged? If so, did it materially affect the result of the election.
- 5 Is any recounting necessary as alleged?
- 6 Is the petition defective because no valid necessary deposit was made. If so, its result
- 7 Is this petition defective for non-joinder of the Returning Officer? If so, its effect.
- 8 To what relief if any, is the petitioner entitled.

Issues were read and explained. No other issue was pressed.

(12) In this case 7 witnesses have been examined from the side of the petitioner, two from the side of respondent No 1, and one as a court witness

(13) The petitioner's witnesses are —

Nameirakpam Bihari Singh (P.W. 1), T. Gough Lecturer (P.W. 2), B. K. Udoi Singh (P.W. 3), Khangembam Amu Singh (P.W. 4), Narengbam Ibotombi Singh (P.W. 5), Sibom Larho (P.W. 6) and Ningthoujam Birendra Singh (P.W. 7)

(14) Of these witnesses P.W. 2 is respondent No 4 and P.W. No. 6 is the petitioner himself.

(15) The two witnesses examined from the side of respondent No 1 are — Ch. Morden Anal (D.W. 1) and K. Envey (D.W. 2).

(16) In this case the Returning Officer was not made a party nor examined as a witness from the either side. He was a very necessary witness and as such I ordered him to be examined as a court witness. He was examined accordingly. He is Sri M. L. Kampani (C.W. 1), the Deputy Commissioner of Manipur.

(17) I shall discuss the statement of these witnesses wherever necessary when dealing with the various issues of this case.

**Issue Nos. 1 and 2.**

(18) According to the case of the petitioner on the second day (11th March, 1962), of the counting of votes two boxes were found at the table where ballot papers of Shingtom polling station (21×21) were being counted. One box had the symbol of Tree on outer-side and that of Scale on the inner side of the box and the other had the symbol of Scale on outer side and that of Tree on the inner side of the ballot box. The Tree symbol was of respondent No 1 and the Scale

symbol was of respondent No. 4. Under the rules the counting should have been done according to the inner symbol, but in fact it was done according to the outer symbol. One box had contained 219 votes and the other had contained 345 votes. 219 votes should have been counted towards respondent No. 1 and 345 votes towards Respondent No. 4, but in fact 345 votes were counted in favour of respondent No. 1 and 219 votes in favour of respondent No. 4. This made a difference of 126 votes. Had the counting been done correctly, respondent No. 1 would have got 126 votes lesser. He has won only by a margin of 42 votes and hence if 126 votes were deducted from his grand total, he would have lost the election and in its place the petitioner would have won it.

(19) Now I shall deal with the evidence adduced on the above point.

(20) *Sri N. Bihari Singh* (P.W. 1) is a clerk in P.W.D., Manipur. He was one of the counting assistants.

(21) He has stated that 5 pairs of counting assistants were sitting on a big table facing each other. The pair of the witness was counting the ballot box of Congress candidate, which had a *pair of bullocks* as its symbol. On their right side was sitting the pair which was counting ballot box carrying symbol of *Tree*. That pair had come across with a ballot box which had outer symbol as *Tree* and inner symbol as *Scale*. The assistant concerned had immediately informed about it to the Returning Officer, who was the Deputy Commissioner. The Returning Officer came there, inspected the box and then took away the ballot box on his own table. For a few minutes the counting was stopped in the hall, but thereafter it continued. He (witness) did not know what happened to that particular box afterwards. In his cross-examination the witness has stated that there were five tables in the hall and the witness was on the first row from the Returning Officer. The distance between his table and that of the Returning Officer was about 10 feet only.

It may be pointed out here that this witness has stated only about one box and that two without reference to any polling station or constituency. According to his own admission he was a member of Youth Congress before joining the service, and was on friendly terms with the present Chairman of the Territorial Council. The petitioner is a Congress member and he was the Chairman of the Territorial Council at the time of the general election. The present Chairman of the Territorial Council is also a Congress member. The witness has further admitted that the present Chairman of the Territorial Council had gone to the house of his neighbour in the preceding evening of the day when the statement of the witness was recorded here, and that he had met the Chairman there at that time. It has been contended from the side of the contesting respondent that this witness was a highly interested person and his evidence should not be relied upon on the above ground, and besides it there are a few more grounds including material contradictions to disbelieve his testimony. I shall deal with it later on.

(22) *Sri T. Gougin* (P.W.2) is a lecturer in a Higher Secondary School. He was a candidate in the last general election and is respondent No. 4 in the present petition. His symbol was *Scale*.

(23) He has stated that on the second day of the counting (which means 11th March 1962) the assistants, who were counting the ballot papers, reported that there was difference in the outer and inner symbols of two ballot boxes. The witness went to the table of Returning Officer and found that one ballot box had *Tree* as its outer symbol and *Scale* as its inner symbol, and the other had *Scale* as its outer symbol and *Tree* as its inner symbol. The witness orally should be done according to the inner symbol. To this the Returning Officer had replied that the counting protested about it and requested that the counting shall be done according to the outer symbol. After this he had gone out for a short period and the ballot papers of both these boxes were counted in his absence. However he had noted down the particulars of the polling station and the votes polled regarding these two ballot boxes when the result of its counting was posted on the board. After refreshing his memory from note the witness stated that the polling station was 21x21 and the number of votes secured by him (*Scale* symbol) was 219 and by the candidate of *Tree* symbol was 345. The name of polling station of 21x21 was Shingtom. In his cross-examination he has stated that he did not remember how many polling stations were counted on that day and he had not made any note of it. He also could not say as to how many polling stations were already counted when the alleged mistake was detected. He had gone out only for five minutes but he did not know to whom these two ballot boxes were handed over for counting. He also did not remember

how long after his return, whether a few minutes or an hour, the result of these two ballot boxes was announced on the board. He had not made any written protest about the alleged difference in the outer and inner symbols of these two ballot boxes.

(24) There were five tables of counting, and according to him the difference in the symbols on the two ballot boxes was found on table No. 4 from the table of the Returning Officer. The question was put and explained to him three times but he gave the same answer. But according to P.W. 1, P.W. 3, and P.W. 7 it was table No. 1 from the Returning Officer where the difference in the symbols was detected. Again according to this witness only one more person was present at the table of the Returning Officer. When he (witness) had made protest to the Returning Officer about the difference in the symbols, but according to P.W. 1 and P.W. 3 there were 9 or 10 persons there at the table of the Returning Officer at that time.

(25) In his cross-examination he has admitted that after the last general election he was appointed as a lecturer by the then Chairman of the Territorial Council. It was the present petitioner who happened to be the Chairman of the Territorial Council (T.C.) at the time of the last general election and also when the witness was appointed as lecturer. The institution where the witness was appointed as a lecturer is under the Territorial Council and according to own admission of the witness he was appointed as a lecturer by the then Chairman of Territorial Council, which means the present petitioner. It has been pointed out by the learned counsel of respondent No. 1 that according to the rules the witness should have been appointed as a lecturer by the Territorial Council and not by the Chairman in his individual capacity as a chairman. The appointment of the witness by the Chairman himself showed that he was highly interested in the witness and had gone out of his way to appoint him as a lecturer by his own order instead of that of the Council. It has been further contended that the witness was provided with the job in return for his promise to give false evidence in support of the petitioner's claim.

(26) Sri R. K. Udoi Singh (P.W. 3) was the counting agent of the petitioner during the last general election.

(27) He has stated that on the second day of the counting at about 12 O'clock in the day difference in the outer and inner symbols of two ballot boxes was found relating to polling station No. 21×24 at table No. 1. On one box the outer symbol was of *Tree* and the inner symbol of *Scale*, and it was just the reverse on the other box. When the counting assistant had found this difference he had stood up and told about it to the Returning Officer. The Returning Officer came to that table, inspected the boxes and then the assistant had taken both the boxes to the table of the Returning Officer. Nine or ten persons had collected at the table of the Returning Officer and respondent No. 4 (P.W. 2) was one of them and he had protested also about it. The witness had requested the Deputy Commissioner (Returning Officer) to stop the counting of votes of both these boxes. There was a small room behind the Returning Officer and both these boxes were handed over to the Assistants who were there in that small room. The Returning Officer had told him that the counting shall be done according to the outer symbol. The witness was not present when actually the counting of votes of both these boxes was carried out. When the result of both these boxes was posted on the board, he had found that *Tree* symbol had polled 345 votes and the *Scale* symbol had polled 219 votes. The witness had given the above statement after refreshing his memory from his note.

(28) After the counting of the second day was over, he (witness) had informed his candidate (petitioner) about the difference in the symbol of the two ballot boxes. A perusal of his cross-examination shows that he had given the above information to the petitioner at about (7 p.m.) at the own house of the petitioner. No one else was present there at that time. The petitioner has been examined as P.W. 6. His statement shows that P.W. 3 had told about it to him in the Congress office at about 1-30 p.m., and that many persons were present there at that time. Thus there is a material contradiction in the above two statements regarding place, time and number of persons present when P.W. 3 is alleged to have told the petitioner (P.W. 6) about the difference of symbols in the two ballot boxes.

(29) It has been pointed out by the learned counsel of respondent No. 1 that this witness was a highly interested person. He was not only counting agent of the petitioner but was also an active member of the Congress.

(30) Sri N. Birendra Singh (P.W. 7) is one of the counting assistants. He has stated that his table was first from that of the Returning Officer. He had found one ballot box with *Tree* symbol outside and *Scale* symbol inside it. He had stood up and told about it to the Returning Officer, who came to his table and saw it. At his saying the witness had carried the ballot box to the table of the Returning Officer. The pair which was counting the ballot box of *Scale* symbol had found one ballot box with *scale* as outer symbol and *Tree* as inner symbol. The witness had seen this box at the table of the Returning Officer. The witness had taken his ballot box first to the table of the Returning Officer and after it the other box was brought there.

(31) He has further stated that he thought that the box which was detected by him was of polling station No. 21×21 but the witness did not remember the name of this polling station (which was Shingtom). Again he could not tell whether 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, 40 or 50 polling stations were counted on that day. He did not remember the number of any other polling station except 21×21. Thus he is ignorant on many material points. There were five rows of counting tables and each row had five tables in it. The row of the witness was first from that of the Returning Officer.

(32) In respect of this witness it has been pointed out by the learned counsel of respondent No. 1 that formerly he was in Government service but had resigned from it some 5 or 6 months back. He wanted to oblige the petitioner in the hope that he might get some good job. It has been further pointed out that he was not a summoned witness and according to his own admission one Congress man had gone to his house and told him to attend court on that day.

(33) Three letters were sent by the petitioner to the Returning Officer regarding counting of ballot boxes of 12th, 13th, and 14th March, 1962 respectively. The first letter is Exbt. B-2, the second is Exbt. A-3 and the third is Exbt. B-3. No reference was made to any of these letters at the time of argument by the learned counsel of the petitioner, though one of these letters (Exbt. A-3) was filed from the side of petitioner himself. It is only the counsel of the contesting respondent who has referred to all these three letters in detail at the time of argument. It has been pointed out by him that there is no mention of any difference to have been found in the symbols of any ballot box regarding polling station No. 21×21 (Shingtom). These are small letters and I think it better to quote these in full:—

*Exhibit B-2 Dated 12-3-1962:—*

(34) "From the reports of my counting agents I strongly suspect that there might have been some unauthorised ballot papers in the boxes of Parliamentary candidates in Thanlon and Churachandpur Constituencies, because the check slips were not, I am so told, properly compared either at the beginning or at the end of the counting and further because such unauthorised ballot papers numbering 200 were found in some T.C. candidates' box at Taithu polling Station No. 12 of Thanlon Constituency and also at polling station No. 17 of Churachandpur constituency. Moreover as the margin of difference being very small a very careful checking and recounting may kindly be deemed necessary".

(35) "I therefore request that you will kindly order and arrange for recounting of votes for the Outer Manipur Constituency specially for Thanlon and Churachandpur constituencies. In the meantime announcement of the result may kindly be withheld".

*Exhibit A-3 Dated 13th March, 1962:—*

(36) "I have received the reports of serious nature from my counting agents who took part in the counting of Outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency that the SYMBOLS patched inside and outside the same ballot boxes are different ones and such serious mistakes occurred in some polling areas. This may lead to incorrect results."

(37) "I shall be very grateful if you kindly supply me detailed information of every incident of the above nature in my constituency and how you have decided in such cases".

*Exhibit B-3 Dated 14th March, 1962:—*

(38) "I the undersigned candidate for the Outer Manipur Parliamentary constituency have the honour to say that my counting agents have reported to me saying that cases of tampering of ballot boxes meant for parliament candidates, were found in the Phaisat constituency No. 22. I want to see the condition of all the parliament ballot boxes for the aforesaid constituency immediately.

(39) "I therefore request that you will kindly give me prompt order allowing the inspection prayed for".

(40) Whatever might have had happened at the time of counting on 11th March 1962, its information was conveyed to the petitioner on the same day at 1-30 p.m. according to own statement of the petitioner (P.W. 6), and at 7 p.m. according to the statement of his counting agent (P.W. 3). The earliest letter sent by the petitioner regarding counting is dated 12th March 1962. In this letter there is absolutely no mention of any irregularity found which is subject matter of this petition. In it was only written that there was suspicion that there might have been some unauthorised ballot papers in the box of Thanlon and Churachandpur constituencies because the check slips were not properly compared.

(41) There is a specific mention of polling station No. 12 of Thanlon constituency and polling station No. 17 of Churachandpur constituency. In the instant case we are concerned with polling station No. 21 (Shingtom) of constituency No. 21 (Tengnoupal) and not with those which have been referred to in the above letter of 12th March 1962. Again there is absolutely no mention of any discrepancy to have been found in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box of any polling station of any constituency, and much less to speak of polling station No. 21 (Shingtom) of constituency No. 21 (Tengnoupal).

(42) It has been contended before me that had it been a fact that any difference in outer and inner symbols of two ballot boxes was found on 11th March 1962 as alleged by the petitioner, it was but natural that its specific mention should have been made in the letter of 12th March 1962. Its absence gives a direct lie to the case now developed that such a difference was found in outer and inner symbols in two ballot boxes of polling station No. 21×21. I find much force in it.

(43) It is in the letter of 13th March 1962 (Exbt. A-3) that there is mention of some difference in the outer and inner symbols of the same ballot boxes of some polling areas, and it has been further stated in it that this might lead to incorrect result. The prayer in this letter is that he should be supplied with details of every such incident as to which constituency it related and in what manner such cases were decided.

(44) In the above letter also the allegations are only general and vague, and if in fact the case of the petitioner as set up now was correct, specific allegations should have been made in which the polling station and the constituency should also have been mentioned. No such thing was done. On the other hand necessary particulars of such incidents were demanded from the Returning Officer which showed that the definite and positive case as set up now did not exist at that time and in any case neither the petitioner nor his counting agent had any knowledge of it till the letter of 13th March 1962 was written.

(45) According to the petitioner's case all the necessary information about the alleged difference in the outer and inner symbols of 2 ballot boxes was conveyed to the petitioner on 11th March 1962 at 1-30 p.m. and yet there was no mention of it either in the letter of 12th March or in that of the 13th March 1962, which the petitioner had written to the Returning Officer. Again according to the petitioner's case a request was made that the ballot papers of both these ballot boxes should be counted according to the inner symbol, but the Returning Officer had told that the counting shall be done according to the outer symbols. If this allegation was correct, what was the need for the petitioner to enquire from the Returning Officer as to in which manner he had decided such cases. On the other hand specific allegations on the above lines should have been made in the letters of 12th and 13th March 1962, but no such thing was done.

(46) In the letter of 14th March 1962 it has been mentioned that tampering of ballot box relating to constituency No. 22 (Phaisat) was reported and the petitioner wanted to see the condition of all the ballot boxes relating to the aforesaid constituency. The contents of this letter had nothing to do with the petitioner's case as set up now regarding constituency No. 21 (Tengnoupal).

(47) At this place I would like to mention that on the petitioner's letter of 12th March 1962, the Returning Officer had ordered for recounting of votes regarding two constituencies, Thanlon and Churachandpur (29 and 30). This recounting was done on 14th March 1962, and the result was declared on the same day after it. A copy of the order passed by the Returning Officer is Exbt. C-2. I think it proper to quote it in full.



(48) "I have considered the points raised by Shri Sibo Larho in his application dated the 12th March 1962.

"The allegation of Shri Larho that he strongly suspects "that there might have been some unauthorised ballot papers in the boxes of Parliamentary candidates in Thanlon and Churachandpur constituencies is very vague. Similarly, the allegation that some unauthorised ballot papers numbering 200 were found in some T.C. candidates' box at Taithu polling station No. 12 of Thanlon constituency and also at polling station No. 17 of Churachandpur constituency" has no bearing to the votes cast for the outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency and as such has no value on the point at issue.

"It is, however, correct that the difference between the votes secured by Shri Rishang and the applicant is only of forty three votes.

"I, therefore, consider the request for recount of two parts i.e. parts 29 and 30 of the Outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency to be reasonable and allow recounting of the ballot papers relating to Shri Rishang and Shri Sibo Larho in respect of parts 29 and 30 of the Outer Manipur Parliamentary Constituency".

(49) A perusal of all the three letters of the petitioner dated 12th March, 13th March, and 14th March 1962 (Exbt. B-2, Exbt. A-3, and Exbt. B3) and the order passed by the Returning Officer (Exbt. C-2) clearly show that there was absolutely no controversy regarding any alleged difference in the outer and inner symbols of any two ballot boxes of Shingtom polling station of Tengnoupal constituency whose number is 21×21. It has been urged by the learned counsel of respondent No. 1 that the above alleged difference was concocted only for the purposes of this petition. Some vague general allegations were made regarding some other irregularities, as is evident from the aforesaid letters, but these were dropped altogether, and in its place quite a new case was set up to form the basis of the present petition.

(50) It may be pointed out here that originally the difference between votes polled by petitioner and respondent No. 1 was of 43 votes but after the recounting the difference was reduced by one vote, which means it came down from 43 to 42 only.

(51) In this case two witnesses have been examined from the side of the contesting respondent. They are Ch. Morden Anal (D.W. 1) and K. Envey (D.W. 2).

(52) D.W. 1 was the polling agent of respondent No. 1 at polling station No. 21×21. He has stated that there was no difference in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box of that polling station. There is no other evidence to rebut his statement. Moreover every official act shall be presumed to have been done properly unless proved otherwise. In his cross-examination this witness has stated that he had reached the polling station at about 8 or 9 A.M. and on its basis it has been urged before me that the witness must have reached after the polling had commenced. It is quite true that the time of commencement of polling of votes was 7 A.M. and in case the witness reached there at 8 or 9 A.M., he could not have the opportunity to examine the symbols of the ballot boxes before the polling had commenced. But this witness has further stated that the polling had commenced half an hour after his reaching there. It appears that the witness had no correct idea of hour and hence no much significance could be attached to his statement that he had reached there at 8 or 9 A.M. specially in the face of the other statement that he had reached there half an hour before the start of the polling. He was expected to remember his latter statement more easily than the former one.

(53) D.W. 2 was the counting agent of respondent No. 1. He has stated that he was present throughout the counting on all the days of the counting and that no difference in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box was found regarding the polling station No. 21×21. He has further stated that neither any difference was found nor there was any occasion for any one to make any protest about it.

(54) This witness is a member of Territorial Council (T.C.) He had contested that election on Socialist ticket, but about 3 months back he had resigned from that party and joined the Congress. It has been pointed out by the learned counsel of respondent No. 1 that under the above circumstances he could not be said to be an interested witness so far as respondent No. 1 was concerned, who is a Socialist.

(55) The Returning Officer was not impleaded as a party nor examined as a witness from either side. In the above circumstances I thought it necessary for him to be examined as a court witness, and he was so examined.

(56) He is Sri M. L. Kampani (C.W. 1), Deputy Commissioner, Manipur. His statement shows that counting of ballot papers of Outer Manipur constituency had commenced on 10th March 1962 and finished on 12th March 1962. He was present on all these three days. There were 31 polling stations in constituency No. 21. The number of Shingtom polling station was 21 and of its constituency also 21, which means  $21 \times 21$ .

(57) This witness has clearly stated that no difference was found in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box in respect of polling station No.  $21 \times 21$  (polling station Shingtom of constituency, Tengnoupal), but in respect of polling station No. 5 (Oklu L.P. School) of constituency No. 21 the outer symbol was found missing on one ballot box on 11th March, 1962. The inner symbol of this box was of Tree which belonged to respondent No. 1. The witness himself had checked the inner symbol, address tag, and the identity slip inside the cover. He had also checked the ballot papers of which there was marking of polling station. All this clearly showed that this box was of respondent No. 1, and it related to polling station No. 21 or 22 of constituency No. 21. Thereafter the witness asked the E.A.C., who was the incharge of the ballot boxes in the counting hall, to check up if any ballot box of polling station No. 5 was mixed up in the lot of boxes of polling station No. 21 or 22. After checking up one such belonging to polling station No. 5 and to respondent No. 4 was found there. The witness had checked this box also. Its outer symbol was missing, but the address tag, the identity slip, the inner symbol, and the marking of polling station at ballot papers were there to show clearly that it did relate to polling station No. 5 and respondent No. 4.

(58) After the above checking the counting of this ballot box was carried out at the place where counting for polling station No. 5 was going on. The first box was kept at the table of the witness (Returning Officer) and when the turn of this polling station (21 or 22) came, this box was handed over for counting and its votes were counted there.

(59) On the first box which was so detected one outer symbol was kept loose at its top and it was of Scale. It appears that somehow or other the outer symbols of two ballot boxes got rubbed off in transit and some one kept the loose outer symbol of Scale at the top of the ballot box of Tree symbol whose outer symbol had also got removed. It must have been got rubbed off accidentally and no inference of tampering with could be drawn from it.

(60) The witness has clearly stated that besides these two boxes there was absolutely no other incident in connection with the counting of the ballot papers. The counting of both the ballot boxes, whose outer symbols were missing, was done according to the inner symbols, which fully tallied with the address-tag, the identity slip, and marking of polling station at the ballot papers. This action of the Returning Officer was quite justified and was in accordance with the rules. At this place it may be mentioned that according to the petitioner's case the Returning Officer had ordered for the counting to be done in accordance with the outer symbol in spite of protest having been made that it should be done according to the inner symbols. This appears to be quite unbelievable. According to the rules when outer symbol was missing, the counting was to be done according to the inner symbol and other marks of identification. In the instant case the inner symbols, the identity slip, and the address-tag were there to clearly show to which candidate the ballot box belonged. In the face of all this there could not have been any reason for the Returning Officer to have ordered the counting to be done in accordance with the outer symbol. Moreover in the instant case no outer symbol was to be found affixed on either of these two ballot boxes. It may be further pointed out that none of these two ballot boxes were discovered at the table where the counting of polling station No. 21 (Shingtom) was going on as alleged by the petitioner. On the other hand one box was found without outer symbol at the table where counting was going on in respect of polling station No. 5 (Oklu L.P. School), and the other box was found in the lot of boxes kept for polling station No. 21 or 22. The witness was not certain whether it was the lot of polling station No. 21 or that of 22.

(61) Some suggestions were made to this witness in his cross-examination regarding the petitioner's case (page 96 to 99 and 103) and the witness categorically denied those suggestions. His statement is quite definite that no difference was found in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box where counting for polling station No. 21 was being done, and no counting assistant of

this polling station had reported any such case to him, nor any occasion for any protest being made by respondent No. 4 had ever arisen. The witness has further stated that there was not the slightest doubt about the correct identity of the ballot box and hence no one had made any protest about it.

(62) The attention of the witness was drawn to all the three letters (Exbts. B-2, A-3, and B-3) written by the petitioner to the witness on 12th March, 13th March, and 14th March 1962, respectively. The witness has stated that on the letter of 12th March 1962 (Exbt. B-2) he had ordered for recounting to be done in respect of constituency No. 29 and 30 as requested. The letters of 13th March and 14th March were received after the order for recounting was already passed and hence these were ordered to be filed. Moreover the letter of 14th March 1962 was received when the recounting was done and the result was already announced. All these three letters have been quoted in full and commented upon in detail by me in the earlier portion of the judgement, and I need not repeat it all here again. It shall suffice to say that there is no mention of any difference in the outer and inner symbols of any ballot box relating to Shington polling station in any of these three letters.

(63) As a matter of fact he (the Returning Officer) is the only independent and impartial witness examined in this case. He had absolutely no reason to give any false statement or show partiality to one candidate or the other. He has given his evidence in a very straight forward manner. I find no reason to disbelieve or doubt the correctness of his testimony.

(64) To sum up, the statement of none of the four witnesses of the petitioner inspired any confidence. There are many contradictions in their statement, and none of these witnesses could be said to be independent and impartial witness. I was not impressed by the demeanour of any of these witnesses. The incident is said to have taken place on 11th March 1962 at about 12 O'clock in the day and the same day full information about it is said to have been conveyed to the petitioner (P.W. 6) by his own counting agent (P.W. 3) at about 1-30 p.m., and yet no mention of it was made in any of the letters written by the petitioner to the Returning Officer on 12th, 13th and 14th March 1962 though mention was made of some other alleged irregularities committed in the counting of votes. None of those other alleged irregularities have been mentioned in the present petition. No explanation is forthcoming as to why no mention of the alleged incident, which is the basis of the present petition, was made in any of those three letters and specially that of 12th March 1962. This is a very strong circumstance to cut the petitioner's case at the very root of it. As a matter of fact it knocks down the very bottom of his case. The Returning Officer was examined as a court witness and he has given a very straight forward and unhesitating statement. I find absolutely no reason to doubt the correctness of his statement. A perusal of his statement clearly shows that the petitioner's case as set up in the present petition was manifestly false. Negative evidence has been led on this point from the side of the contesting respondent also.

(65) After giving my careful and anxious consideration to the entire facts and circumstances of the case I have come to the conclusion that the petitioner failed to prove that one such ballot box was found regarding Shington polling station (No. 21×21) on which the outer symbol was of *Tree* and the inner symbol was of *Scale* and that it contained 345 votes, which were all counter in favour of respondent No. 1; and another box was found on which the outer symbol was of *Scale* and the inner symbol was of *Tree* and that it contained 219 votes which were all counted in favour of respondent No. 4. The result is that issues No. 1 and 2 (both parts) are found in the negative.

#### Issue No 3

(66) Because of the finding on issues No. 1 and 2 this issue did not arise and it must be found in the negative. The issue is accordingly decided in the negative.

#### Issue No. 4

(67) A perusal of finding on issues No. 1 and 2 clearly shows that no illegality was committed in counting of votes as alleged by the petitioner, and as such this issue also must be decided in the negative.

(68) In this connection reference has been made to the statement of the Returning Officer (C.W. 1) about two ballot boxes on which outer symbol was missing. These boxes were not detected where the counting of Shington polling station was going on as alleged by the petitioner. Any way, the mere absence of outer symbol could not be fatal. The inner symbol, address tag, and identity

slip were there to clearly show to which polling station and to which candidate both these ballot boxes belonged. There was marking of polling station at each of the ballot papers also and this also clearly helped in finding out to which polling station both these boxes did in fact belong. The Returning Officer had made a thorough checking and when he was completely satisfied about the correct identity of the ballot box, the counting of its ballot papers was carried out with reference to inner symbols, which fully tallied with other marks of identification. This was exactly what the relevant rules required him to do.

(69) It has been mentioned in the petition itself that if any question arises as to the candidate to whom a particular box was allotted at the poll, the Returning Officer shall decide such question by a reference to the symbol inside the box. This is exactly what has been laid down in sub-rule (7) of Rule 55A which deals with the security and opening of ballot boxes. The Deputy Commissioner had ordered the counting of ballot papers of those two ballot boxes to be done with reference to the inner symbol which fully tallied with the address tag, and the identity slip. This action of the Returning Officer was quite in conformity with the rule whose relevant portion was quoted by the petitioner himself at page No. 2, of his petition. It (sub-section (8) of Rule 55-A of Conduct of Election Rules, 1961) runs as follows:—

(70) "If any question arises as to the candidate to whom a particular ballot box was allotted at the poll, the Returning Officer shall decide such question by a reference to the symbol inside the box:

Provided that:—

- (a) if there is no symbol inside the box, or
- (b) if the symbol inside the box has been damaged or mutilated beyond recognition, or
- (c) if the same symbol is found on two or more boxes used at the same polling station, the Returning Officer shall, wherever possible, decide the question by reference to all relevant circumstances including the distinguished marks on the ballot box, and where he does not consider it possible to decide the question, he shall immediately refer it to the Election Commission for its decision."

(71) It was contended by the learned counsel of the petitioner that in the instant case the Returning Officer should have stopped the counting of votes and made a reference to the Election Commission for its decision about the two ballot boxes, but I do not find any force in it. The Returning Officer was bound to refer the matter to the Election Commission only where he was unable to decide the question himself regarding the correct identity of the ballot box. In the instant case the inner symbol, the address tag, and the identity slip left no room for any doubt about the correct identity of the ballot box. The Returning Officer had acted on its basis and his action was quite in conformity with what was laid down in Rule 55-A(7).

(72) In this connection it has been contended by the learned counsel of Respondent No. 1 that even if for the sake of argument it is conceded that some irregularity was made out to have occurred from the statement of C.W. 1 (Returning Officer), the petitioner cannot take any advantage of it because no such case was set up in the petition. Moreover the court witness (C.W. 1) was examined after the close of respondent's evidence and he (respondent) had absolutely no opportunity to meet it at all. I find some force in the above argument.

(73) For the reasons given above I find that no illegality was committed in counting of votes as alleged by the petitioner and hence issue No. 4 is decided in the negative.

#### Issue No. 5

(74) As no illegality or material irregularity was committed during the course of counting, no recounting was necessary, and hence this issue must be found in the negative. It is decided in the negative accordingly.

#### Issue No. 6

(75) This issue was not pressed and was given up at the time of argument. Moreover there was no defect in the deposit which could prove fatal to the petition. The issue is decided in the negative accordingly.

*Issue No 7*

(76) This issue was also not pressed and was given up at the time of argument. Moreover it may be pointed out that the Returning Officer was not a necessary party though he might have been a proper party. Section 82 of the Representation of the People Act makes it obligatory to implead only all the candidates who were duly nominated at the election other than the petitioner, if he was so nominated. As such his non-joinder could not be fatal to the petition. The issue is decided in the negative accordingly.

*Issue No. 8*

(77) Having regard to my findings on issues No 1 to 5 and specially issues No 1 and 2 the petitioner is entitled to no relief and his petition must be dismissed with cost to respondent No 1, which I assess at Rs. 250/-.

**ORDER**

It is hereby ordered that the petition is dismissed with Rs. 250/- as cost to the contesting respondent No 1, which shall be paid out of the security deposit of Rs 1,000/- made by the petitioner.

Six copies of this judgment be sent to the Election Commission, India and another copy to the Election Officer of Union Territory, Manipur.

M H KHAN,  
Member, Election Tribunal,  
(District Judge, Manipur),  
Manipur,  
The 18th December 1962.

The judgment signed, dated and pronounced in open court

M. H KHAN,  
Member, Election Tribunal,  
Mampur,  
The 18th December 1962  
[No 82/341/62]

**S.O. 135.**—The following Order of the Chief Election Commissioner is published for general information —

**ORDER No 10**

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of section 8 of the Two Member Constituencies (Abolition) Act, 1961, I hereby make the following amendments in Schedule X of the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies Order, 1961, namely —

In Part B of the said Schedule,—

- (i) for the entry in column 2 against item 6, the entry "Malkangiri sub-division" shall be substituted,
- (ii) in the entry in column 2 against item 11, for the word "Rayagada" the word "Gunupur" shall be substituted,
- (iii) for the entry in column 2 against item 12, the entry "K Singpur police station in Rayagada sub-division, and Ambodola and Bissamcutta police stations and Chandrapur outpost in Gudari police station in Gunupur sub-division" shall be substituted,
- (iv) for the entry in column 2 against item 35, the entry "Thuamal-Rampur police station in Bhawanipatna sub-division; and Kasipur police station in Rayagada sub-division (of Koraput district)" shall be substituted, and

- (v) in the Note at the end, for the words and figures "of April, 1961" the words and figures "of January, 1963" shall be substituted.

K. V. K. SUNDARAM,  
Chief Election Commissioner, India.

[No. 282/OR/62.]

By Order,  
PRAKASH NARAIN, Secy.

*New Delhi, the 10th January 1963*

S.O. 136.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the Order pronounced on the 29th December, 1962, by the Election Tribunal, Jorhat.

### BEFORE THE ELECTION TRIBUNAL AT JORHAT

PRESENT:

Shri R. Medhi, B.L.,  
Member, Election Tribunal.

AND

District & Sessions Judge,  
Upper Assam Districts,  
Jorhat.

ELECTION PETITION No. 52 OF 1962

Begum Mafida Ahmed—*Petitioner.*

*versus*

1. Rajendra Nath Barua
2. Hemchandra Saha—*Respondents.*

*For the petitioner* —Shri H. K. Roy, Advocate,  
Shri R. Bora, Advocate.

*For respondent No. 1*—Shri G. N. Barua, Advocate.  
Shri M. Barua, Pleader.

*Date of order:* 29th December 1962.

### JUDGMENT AND ORDER

This petition has been filed by Begum Mafida Ahmed with a prayer for declaring the election of respondent No. 1, Rajendra Nath Barua, as void and to set aside his election for the Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency, and also to declare herself to be duly elected if it is found on re-counting that she has secured more votes than respondent No. 1.

The petitioner was a contesting candidate on Congress ticket for the Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency, State of Assam, in the election held in February, 1962. Respondent No. 1, Rajendra Nath Barua, was a candidate who contested the election on P.S.P. ticket and he was declared elected. Respondent No. 2, Hemchandra Saha, was the third contesting independent candidate. After the election was held votes polled by each of the candidates were counted, and it was found that the P.S.P. candidate polled 78,091; Congress candidate polled 77,164 and the independent candidate polled 30,340. There were 10,653 invalid votes. As a result of this counting respondent No. 1, Rajendra Nath Barua, the P.S.P. candidate was declared elected.

The Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency comprised of two sub-divisions i.e. Jorhat and Golaghat. In Jorhat sub-division there were five Assembly constituencies and four in the Golaghat Sub-division. Counting was done at Jorhat and at Golaghat. The petitioner herself supervised the counting at Golaghat and the supervision of counting at Jorhat was entrusted to her counting agents. On 27th February 1962 when the petitioner returned from Golaghat she understood from her agents that at Jorhat the Returning Officer had made some changes in the counting hall which resulted in serious difficulties and anomalies, and that the Returning Officer approved only 8 counting agents out of 20 names given by her. It was also understood by the petitioner that the counting went on simultaneously on 34 tables in one hall with the result that it was not possible for the petitioner's agents to watch the counting effectively. Moreover, 4

out of the 8 of the petitioner's agents observed Ramzan fasting and hence four agents of the petitioner alone had to watch the counting on 34 tables going on simultaneously. The petitioner's request for relievers was rejected. The petitioner further alleged that there was irregularity and anomaly in the counting of votes and that ballot papers with the petitioner's symbol were improperly accepted in favour of the rival candidates. It was also stated that 10653 votes were rejected as improper, and the petitioner will be in a position to furnish full details of the aforesaid votes only after inspection and she made a prayer for permission of such an inspection. The difference in votes polled between the petitioner and respondent No. 1 being very narrow, the petitioner alleged that she has reasons to believe that if a recounting is ordered and if improperly accepted votes are excluded and improperly rejected votes are included, the respondent No. 1 will be found to have polled less votes as compared to the petitioner. Then it is submitted that the result of the election has been materially affected by the improper acceptance and rejection of votes by the persons concerned and hasty and unchecked counting. Due to improper counting of votes the petitioner on 27th February 1962 at 9-30 A.M. addressed a letter to the Returning Officer requesting him to postpone the announcement of the result of the Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency as figures taken by the counting agents of the petitioner did not tally with the official figures. The petitioner sent an express telegram to the Chief Electoral Officer, Assam, Shillong, protesting against the illegal and improper methods adopted in counting the votes and demanding re-counting.

The petitioner submitted that the counting of votes at Jorhat by the Returning Officer, Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency, Jorhat, was not only irregular but also illegal and the figures as declared by the said officer are not correct figures. The procedure adopted in counting of votes resulted in improper acceptance of votes by the Returning Officer, and hence under the provisions laid down in Section 100 of the Representation of the People Act and the Rules framed thereunder were contravened.

The petitioner, therefore, prays that the election of the 1st respondent be declared void and set aside; that a re-counting of the votes polled in Jorhat Sub-division (Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency) in the election held be ordered; and that if on re-counting it is found that the petitioner has received a larger number of votes then the petitioner should be declared to have been duly elected.

The 2nd respondent, Hemchandra Saha, put in Written Statement but did not contest. The 1st respondent, Rajendra Nath Barua, filed Written Statement and resisted the petition. It was stated in the Written Statement filed by the 1st respondent that the counting of votes proceeded correctly according to the prescribed rules and procedure and there was no difficulty in counting the votes and agents were appointed and approved according to law and neither the petitioner nor her agents brought any anomaly to the notice of the Returning Officer. It was further stated that the allegations of the petitioner were merely on suspicion. Respondent No. 1 submitted that there can be no election petition for re-counting of votes. The respondent No. 1 further submitted that the petitioner contravened Section 83 of the Representation of the People Act and that the petition is not in accordance with law and the verification is improper as the petitioner has not disclosed the source of her information. Respondent No. 1, therefore, prays that the petition be dismissed with costs to the respondent.

On the pleadings the following issues were framed—

- (1) Whether the petition can lie merely for recounting of votes?
- (2) Whether the petition is tenable in law and whether there can be order for recounting the votes?
- (3) Whether the petition is properly verified and drawnup according to law?
- (4) Whether there are valid grounds for setting aside the election?
- (5) Whether there was any non-compliance of the Rules regarding counting of votes and whether any votes were improperly accepted or rejected which materially affected the result of the election as alleged in the petition?
- (6) What relief, if any, are the parties entitled to?

After the issues were framed inspection of the used ballot papers of the Jorhat sub-division was allowed by my order dated 23rd August 1962. Inspection was done and the Returning Officer sent his report. Afterwards, however, when the inspection of the used ballot papers of Jorhat Sub-division was done the petitioner applied for inspection of the used ballot papers of the Golaghat Sub-division as well, which was, however, rejected by my order dated 2nd November 1962.

Thereafter when the report of the Returning Officer on the inspection was received the petitioner came up again with a prayer for amendment of the petition to include the inspection of the whole of the Jorhat Parliamentary Constituency. This prayer was also rejected after hearing the parties by my order dated 6th December 1962.

Then evidence was gone into and the petitioner examined 5 witnesses for her but she did not examine herself. No evidence was adduced on behalf of the contesting respondent No. 1.

After that the votes inspected were scrutinised as shown in the report. Then both the parties advanced their arguments.

**Issues 1 and 2.**—When the grounds for declaring an election to be void under section 100(d) (iii) and (iv) of the Representation of the People Act are for improper reception, refusal or rejection of any vote or reception of any vote which is void, or for non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of the Representation of the People Act or any Rules or Orders made thereunder, then, I think, re-counting of votes is necessary; and for this purpose inspection and re-counting may be done. As such when the petitioner has alleged improper acceptance or rejection of votes, the petition merely on the ground of re-counting is maintainable. These two issues, are, therefore, answered in the affirmative.

**Issue No. 3.**—The verification in the petition shows that only the paragraphs 1—3 of the petition are true to the knowledge of the petitioner, and the other averments of the petition are to the best of her information and belief. The petitioner has not shown the source of her information; as such, the verification is not strictly in accordance with the verification of pleadings. This issue is answered accordingly.

**Issue No. 5.**—The petitioner's only grievance is that there was non-compliance with the Rules regarding counting of votes, and that due to improper acceptance and rejection of votes the result of the election was materially affected.

The allegations in the petition appear to be more or less suspicious and imaginary, and nothing definite has been shown as to how there was irregularity in the counting of votes. The petition, however, indicates that there was some mistake in counting inasmuch as some ballot papers marked with the petitioner's symbol were mis-placed in the pigeon hole meant for the rival candidate. Besides this no other irregularity has been mentioned, nor does it show how votes were accepted or rejected. The petitioner has also not examined herself nor adduced any evidence in this respect.

As the allegation is that there was improper acceptance and rejection of votes, inspection was granted and the inspection was limited to Jorhat sub-division alone as it was pointedly asked for in the petition. After the inspection the scrutiny was personally done by me, and I have found that some votes were, of course, wrongly accepted in favour of the contesting respondent, and with respect to some the Returning Officer appears to have exercised his discretion in accepting. The petitioner has not been able to show how the Returning Officer exercised his discretion wrongly. The Rules give discretion to the Returning Officer in the matter of acceptance or rejection of votes.

The result of the inspection shows that 608 votes were alleged to have been improperly counted in favour of the respondent No. 1, and 144 votes of the petitioner were improperly rejected. Excepting the votes which are definitely for other candidates counted for respondent No. 1, and some others which are wrongly accepted, the others regarding which the Returning Officer exercised his discretion as for not having the distinguishing marks or for marking on the shaded area towards the returned candidate may be taken as properly accepted. Now even if the entire number i.e. 608 regarding which the petitioner objected as having been wrongly accepted in favour of the respondent No. 1 be deducted from the total number of votes polled by the first respondent, and the 144 votes which the petitioner found in inspection to be wrongly rejected be added to the total of her votes, it will



show that the respondent No. 1 will still have 77,483 as against 77,328 for the petitioner. This will show that the respondent No. 1 still leads by 155 votes.

During the inspection and scrutiny objections were raised on various grounds as to the acceptance and rejection of votes, viz., for not having distinguishing mark, use of different ink, mark on back side, indistinct and double or multiple marks and for counting votes cast for other candidates for the respondent No. 1, and for having prominent mark on one or the other of the candidates where there are more marks than one. I do not see any reason to interfere with the finding of the Returning Officer where he being satisfied, has exercised discretion. But there are quite a number of votes on back side and double or multiple marks on the front side both in the accepted and rejected votes. Such votes are not valid votes. Indistinct mark for only one candidate can, however, be counted. Ballot paper bearing more marks than one cannot be accepted whether one is more prominent than the other, if the intention to vote for one cannot be gathered, and herein comes the question of discretion.

Both the number of improperly accepted and rejected votes as objected to by the petitioner contain many votes which cannot be said to have been wrongly accepted or rejected. So the entire number of 608 votes said to have been improperly accepted cannot be deducted from the total of votes polled by the respondent No. 1, nor can the entire lot of 144 votes the petitioner said to have been wrongly rejected be added to the votes polled by the petitioner. Scrutiny shows that a number of votes cast for the respondent No. 2 and about 12 votes cast for the petitioner were wrongly counted for the respondent No. 1. And even if these 12 votes were counted for the petitioner, her votes cannot exceed the total number of votes polled by the respondent No. 1, and as such the result of the election cannot be said to have been materially affected. And a slight mistake in counting of a few votes in the ballot paper account as pointed out during scrutiny and argument, I have seen, cannot materially affected the election or alter the position.

In the scrutiny I have made list of the ballot papers regarding which there were objections and made a complete note of the objections raised noting the number of each ballot paper, polling station and other details, and this is on record. But in view of the discussion made above it is needless to discuss and give decision on each and every ballot paper one by one.

Thus it will appear that the petitioner has failed to show that she has obtained more votes, and so there can be no question of her being declared elected. The portion of the prayer, therefore, cannot stand, and the petitioner has also given a go-bye to this prayer, during argument.

It appears to me that the Returning Officer followed the instruction regarding counting, but there has been some mistakes in the counting, and the Returning Officer seems to have exercised his discretion properly according to the Rules. It has been pointed out in the argument and also a special petition No. 401 was filed during argument to the effect that one Polling Station No. 33 of Teok Assembly Constituency was changed from one place to another without intimation. This irregularity has not been mentioned in the petition, nor has it been shown how this materially affected the petitioner. This may be due to exigencies of circumstances and for administrative convenience.

During scrutiny one special petition No. 397 was filed by the petitioner for calling for the ballot paper accounts. The ballot paper accounts, however, were produced with the packets of the inspected ballot papers. It was submitted that some of the ballot paper accounts were not filled up in the portion required to be filled up by the Presiding Officer at the time of polling. I have also noticed that a few ballot paper accounts were, of course, not filled up as alleged. But nothing has been shown as to how this could materially affect the counting. This may be an omission. I further do not see any reason to lay any very great importance on such irregularity which cannot be considered material.

As no irregularity worth the name has been committed by the Returning Officer in the matter of counting of votes except some mistakes here and there, and as also the result of the inspection and scrutiny does not show that the result of the election was materially affected, the election of the respondent No. 1 cannot be declared to be void. This issue is answered and decided accordingly.

*Issue No. (4).*—In view of the above finding there are no valid grounds for setting aside the election. This issue is answered accordingly.

*Issue No. (6).*—The result of the above findings is that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief claimed by her, and the petition is liable to be dismissed with costs. This is answered accordingly.

In the result the petition fails and the same is hereby dismissed on contest. The petitioner do pay a sum of Rs. 500 as costs to respondent No. 1.

Dictated and corrected by me.

R. MEDHI, 29-12-62  
Member, Election Tribunal, Jorhat.

R. MEDHI, 29-12-62  
Member Election Tribunal Jorhat.

[No. 82/52/62.]

By Order,

K. S. RAJAGOPALAN, Under Secy.

### MINISTRY OF LAW

(Department of Legal Affairs)

New Delhi, the 9th January 1963

S.O. 137.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 57 of the Administrator General's Act, 1913 (3 of 1913), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the late Home Department (Judicial), No. F. 620/32, dated the 25th July, 1932, as amended, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, the entries "Belgium, Peru and Sweden" against serial Nos. 3, 7 and 9, respectively, shall be omitted and the serial Nos. 4 to 13 shall be re-numbered as serial Nos. 3 to 10.

[No. 14(3)/62-J.]

For and on behalf of the President,  
of India and in his name.

H. C. DAGA, Jt. Secy.

### MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 14th January 1963

S.O. 138.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (2) of article 77 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Authentication (Orders and other Instruments) Rules, 1958 (published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs, No. S.O. 2297 dated the 3rd November, 1958) namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Authentication (Orders and other Instruments) Amendment Rules, 1963.
2. In clause (h) of rule 2 of the Authentication (Orders and other Instruments) Rules, 1958, before the words "the Attaches", the words "the Directors," shall be inserted.

[No. F. 3/1/63-Pub.I.]

FATEH SINGH, Jt. Secy.

### MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Office of the Controller of Capital Issues)

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th January 1963

S.O. 139.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Capital Issues (Control) Act, 1947 (29 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following order to amend the Capital Issues (Exemption) Order,

1961, published with the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance No. F. 14(2)-CCI/58-2129, dated the 23rd May, 1961, namely:—

1. This order may be called the Capital Issues (Exemption) Amendment Order, 1963

2. In the Capital Issues (Exemption) Order, 1961, in clause 3, after sub-clause (i) the following sub-clause shall be inserted, namely:—

“(j) third party guarantees on behalf of a company in respect of—

(i) the loans granted or debentures taken up by the institutions specified in sub-clause (d); and

(ii) the advances, overdrafts or guarantees, referred to in sub-clause (f), granted or furnished or to be granted or furnished by a banking institution.”

[No. R. 534-CCI/62.]

M. K. VENKATACHALAM,

Controller of Capital Issues.

#### (Department of Economic Affairs)

#### CORRIGENDUM

In the Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department, as on 7th December 1962, published in the Gazette of India, dated 22nd December 1962, Part II, Section 3(ii) on page 4134, on “ASSETS” side, for the amount “1,76,82,000” indicated against item (iii) “Others” under “Loans and Advances to:—” read “1,67,82,000”.

[No. Gen. 276/4-62/63.]

Sd./- ILLEGIBLE,

Chief Accountant.

#### CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

#### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 10th January 1963

S.O. 140.—In the Board's notification No. 89 dated the 15th December 1962 published in Part II Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India as S.O. No. 3807 dated the 22nd December 1962 for the words “shall take effect from 15th December 1962” appearing in last line of the notification, read “shall take effect from 24th December 1962”.

[No. 3(F.No 50/6/62-IT).]

J. RAMA IYER, Under Secy.

#### MINISTRY OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 10th January 1963

S.O. 141.—The Central Government, having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), by The Calcutta Wheat and Seeds Association, 149, Cotton Street, Calcutta, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Association for a further period of one year from the 31st January, 1963 upto the 30th January, 1964 both days inclusive, in respect of forwards contracts in linseed in the City of Calcutta.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Association shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[No. 34(1)-TMP/FMC/63.]

*New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 142.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. SRO 248, dated the 25th January, 1955, namely:—

In the said notification—

- (i) in the proviso, the word "Pepper" shall be omitted;
- (ii) in the Schedule, item 7 and the entry relating thereto shall be omitted and items (8), (9), (10) and (11) shall be renumbered as items (7), (8), (9) and (10) respectively.

[No. 34(17)-TMP/FMC/62-I.]

**S.O. 143.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), the Central Government hereby declares that no person shall, save with the permission of the Central Government, enter into any forward contract for the sale or purchase of pepper in any place in India except in the State of Kerala and within the limits of Greater Bombay as defined in the Bombay General Clauses Act 1904 (Bombay Act I of 1904), as in force in the State of Maharashtra.

[No. 34(17)-TMP/FMC/62-II.]

**S.O. 144.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952), the Central Government hereby declares that the said section shall apply to pepper within the limits of Greater Bombay as defined in the Bombay General Clauses Act, 1904 (Bombay Act I of 1904) as in force in the State of Maharashtra.

[No. 34(17)-TMP/FMC/62-III.]

**S.O. 145.**—The Central Government, having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for recognition made under section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by The Pepper and Ginger Merchants' Association Limited, Bombay and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Association for a period of one year from the 19th January, 1963 upto the 18th January, 1964 both days inclusive, in respect of forward contracts in pepper within the limits of Greater Bombay as defined in the Bombay General Clauses Act, 1904 (Bombay Act I of 1904), as in force in the State of Maharashtra.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Association shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[No. 34(17)-TMP/FMC/62-IV.]

M. L. GUPTA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 146.**—The Government of Bihar having nominated Shri K. K. Srivastava, Additional Director of Industries, Patna, to be a member of the Central Silk Board under clause (g) of sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), in place of Shri C. B. Prasad, Additional Director of Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 799, dated the 7th April, 1961, namely:—

In the said notification, for the entry against serial number 13 the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

- "13. Shri K. K. Srivastava, Additional Director of Industries, Government of Bihar, Patna."

[F. No. 22(1)/61-HS(2).]

R. KALYANASUNDARAM, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th January 1963

**S.O. 147.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Tea Act, 1953 (29 of 1953), the Government hereby appoints Shri A. K. Ray, an Officer in the Audit and Accounts Service, as Deputy Chairman, Tea Board, Calcutta, with effect from the 1st of November 1962.

[No. 10 (2) (A)/62.]

#### FURTHER CONTROL

New Delhi, the 11th January 1963

**S.O. 148.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of sub-section (3) of section 2 of the Tea Act, 1953 (29 of 1953), read with sub-rule (4) of rule 3 of the Rules, 1953, the Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Vasu Panicker as a member of the Tea Board with effect from the 11th January, 1963 and to be the 5th November, 1964 to represent the interests of tea and directs that the following order amendment shall be made in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, No. S.O. 2636, dated the 6th November 1961, namely:—

In the said notification, insert for the following:

“Dr. T. T. Chacko, General Secretary, Chiruvu Chettu Thottam Theozhali Union Mundakayam, Madras,”

the following entry shall be added, namely:—

“Shri K. K. Vasu Panicker, Congress House, Travandrum”.

[No. F. 15(2) Plant (B)/61.]

B. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

#### CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 9th January 1963

**S.O. 149.**—In the Ministry of Commerce and Industry Order No. S.O. 1258 dated the 17th April, 1962 published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 26th April, 1962.

For “21—Shri P. S. Kothari, Meleod & Co., Bilaspur Paper Mills Co., Calcutta.”

Read “21—Shri P. S. Kothari, Managing Director, Nepa Mills Ltd., P.O. Nepanagar (Madhya Pradesh).”

[No. 4(38)/L.Pr./61.]

S. P. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

#### NOTICES

Calcutta, the 11th October 1962

**S.O. 150.**—It is hereby notified that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. FCB778/60/EI/CCI/C dated 24th December 1960 valued at Rs. 1,736/- for the import of Nutmegs (Serial No. 28 of Pt. IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested

In the said licence No. E397760/60/EI/CCI/C dated the 24th December 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-I.]

**S.O. 151.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E397761/60/EI/CCI/C dated 24th December 1960 valued at Rs. 1,736 for the import of Nutmegs (Serial No. 28 of Pt. IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party who may be interested in the said licence No. E397761/60/EI/CCI/C dated the 24th December 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-II.]

**S.O. 152.**—It is hereby notified that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E405048/60/EI/CCI/C dated the 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 5,561 for the import of Drugs and Medicines as per list I of Appendix XIX to the Red Book (Serial Nos. 87 & 109 of Pt. IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E 405048/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-III.]

**S.O. 153.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E405049/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 5,561 for the import of Drugs and Medicines as per list I of Appendix XIX to the Red Book (Serial Nos. 87 and 109 of Pt. IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E405049/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-IV.]

**S.O. 154.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E 395375/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs 4766/- for the import of Drugs & Medicines as per list 1 of Appendix XIX to the Red Book. (Serial Nos. 87 & 100 of part IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co. 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above M/s. Virjee Daya and Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E 395375/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-V.]

**S.O. 155.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395379/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November, 1960 valued at Rs. 14044/- for the import of Dammer including Unrefined (Serial No. 49-A-II/IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta-7 unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above M/s Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395379/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November, 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-VI.]

**S.O. 156.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395380/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs 9363/- for import of Dammer including Unrefined Batu (Serial No 49-A-II/IV) from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta-7, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2 Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395380/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta

[No. 249/60, CDN-VII.]

**S.O. 157.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395389/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 4681/- for the import of Dammer including Unrefined Batu (Serial No. 49-A-II/IV) from the Soft Currency area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of

this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395389/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-VIII.]

**S.O. 158.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395377/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 14573/- for the import of Gambier [Serial No. 46 (B) of Pt. IV] from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395377/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-IX.]

**S.O. 159.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395378/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 10000/- for the import of Gambier [Serial No. 46 (B)/IV] from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya and Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395378/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-X.]

**S.O. 160.**—It is hereby notified, that in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import (Control) Order, 1955, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry propose to cancel licence No. E395376/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 valued at Rs. 7287/- for the import of Gambier [Serial No. 46(E) of Pt. IV] from the Soft Currency Area except Union of South Africa, granted by the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta to M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, unless sufficient cause against this is furnished to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, within ten days of the date of issue of this notice, by the said M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in it.

2. In view of what is stated above, M/s. Virjee Daya & Co., 193/2, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta or any Bank, or any other party, who may be interested in the said licence No. E395376/60/EI/CCI/C dated 7th November 1960 are hereby directed not to enter into any commitments against the said licence and return it immediately to the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta.

[No. 249/60/CDN-XI.]

S. K. SEN.  
Jt. Chief Controller of  
Imports & Exports, Calcutta.



(Indian Standards Institution,

New Delhi, the 7th January 1963

**S.O. 161.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (r) of regulation 5 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been cancelled.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard cancelled.	No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which Establishment of the Standard was published
1	IS : 107-1952 Specification for Ready Mixed Paint, Brushing, Red Oxide-Chrome, Priming.	S. P. D. No. 107 published in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3, Sub-section 2, 1955.
	IS : 108-1952 Specification for Ready Mixed Paint, Spraying, Red Oxide-Zinc Chrome, Priming.	Do.
3	IS : 135-1952 Specification for Ready Mixed paint Spraying, Stoving, Red Oxide-Zinc Chrome, Priming.	Do.
4	IS : 136-1952 Specification for Ready Mixed Paint, Brushing, Stoving, Red Oxide-Zinc Chrome, Priming.	Do.
5	IS : 519-1954 Specification for T-Slots, T-Bolts and T-Nuts (Tentative).	Do.

[No. MD/13/57].

G. N. BODAWAL,  
Head of the Certification Marks Division.

MINISTRY OF MINES & FUEL

New Delhi, the 8th January 1963

**S.O. 162.** In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), and of all powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Department of Mines and Fuel) S.O. No. 819 dated the 10th April, 1961.

[No. C2-20(6)/61.]

**S.O. 163.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby appoints the Director of Administration, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., and the Deputy Director (Revenue), National Coal Development Corporation, Ltd., to be competent authorities for the purposes of section 22 of the said Act.

[No. C2-1(11)/62.]

**S.O. 164.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendments to the notification of the

Government of India in the late Ministry of Steel, Mines and Fuel (Department of Mines and Fuel) No SRO 2434 dated the 16th July, 1957, namely.—

In the Schedule to the said notification, for the existing entries in the third column against Serial Nos 1, 2 and 4 the following entries shall be substituted, namely —

- |       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sl No | “Chief Geologist and Director of Drilling, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 1     | Director of Planning, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Chief Engineer (Excavating), National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Drilling Superintendent, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Senior Geologist National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Assistant Drilling Superintendent, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Assistant Drilling Engineer, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Geologists, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Senior Survey Officer National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Survey Officer, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd |
| 2     | Director of Administration National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Deputy Director (Revenue), National Coal Development Corporation Ltd                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 4     | Director of Administration, National Coal Development Corporation Ltd<br>Deputy Director (Revenue), National Coal Development Corporation Ltd                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

[No C2-1(11)/62]

#### ERRATUM

*New Delhi the 8th January 1963*

**SO 165**—In the Schedule to the Notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Mines and Fuel, SO No 3687 dated the 29th November, 1962, published at pages 4024 to 4026 in Part II, Section (3) sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 8th December, 1962 —

at page 4025 —

- (i) In the heading ‘Plot Nos acquired in village Fambubahal’ for “Fambubahal” read “Jambubahal”
- (ii) Under the heading ‘Plot Nos acquired in village Sadajorda’ insert “11/3438” before ‘3458’ and after ‘11/3437”
- (iii) Under heading “plot Nos acquired in village Natidi” For “601(P)/605” read 601/605(P)”
- (iv) In the paragraph beginning with “C-D line passes through ” for “75” read “76”

[No C2-21(2)/59]

P S KRISHNAN, Under Secy

### MINISTRY OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE

(Department of Food)

*New Delhi the 9th January, 1963*

**SO 166**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act 1955 (10 of 1955) the Central Government hereby makes the following order further to amend the Fruit Products Order, 1955, namely —

- 1 This order may be called as the Fruit Products (Amendment) Order, 1963
- 2 In the Fruit Products Order 1955, in sub-clause (I) of clause 3, after item (c), the following items shall be inserted, namely —  
“(cc) one representative of the small scale manufacturers of Murabba, Chutney and Pickles, to be nominated by the Licencing Officer;

(etc) One representative of the small scale manufacturers of canned fruits, canned vegetables, jams, jellies and marmalades, to be nominated by the Licensing Officer;".

[No. F. 4-40/60-AM.]

V. S. NIGAM, Under Secy.

(Department of Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 10th January 1963

**S.O. 167.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules regulating the method of recruitment to the posts of Chief Conservators of Forests, Conservator of Forests, Deputy Conservator of Forests and Assistant Conservators of Forests in the Forest Department of Himachal Pradesh Administration, namely:—

**1. Short Title.** These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Forest Department (Class I posts) Recruitment Rules 1963.

**2. Application.**—These rules shall apply to the posts of Chief Conservator of Forests, Conservators of Forests, Deputy Conservators of Forests and Assistant Conservators of Forests in the Forest Department, Himachal Pradesh Administration.

**3. Number of posts. Classification and scale of pay.**—The number of posts etc. classification and the scale of pay attached to the said posts, shall be as specified in columns 2 to 4 of the schedule to these rules.

**4. Method of recruitment, age limit and other qualifications etc.**—The method of recruitment to the posts aforesaid, age limit, qualifications, and other matters connected therewith, shall be as specified in columns 5 to 13 of the said schedule.

Provided that the upper age limit prescribed for direct recruitment may be relaxed in the case of candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, displaced persons and other special categories in accordance with the orders issued from time to time by the Government of India.

**5. Disqualifications.**—(a) No person who has more than one wife living or who having a spouse living, marries in any case in which such marriage is void by reason of its taking place during the life time of such spouse, shall be eligible for appointment to any of the said posts.

(b) No woman whose marriage is void by reason of the husband having a wife living at the time of such marriage or who has married a person who has a wife living at the time of such marriage, shall be eligible for appointment to any of the said posts.

Provided that the Central Government may, if satisfied that there are special grounds for so ordering exempt any person from the operation of this rule.

SCH

*Recruitment Rules for the posts of Chief Conservator of Forests, Conservators of Forests, Deputy*

Name of post	No. of posts	Classification	Scale of pay	Whether selection post or non-selection post	Age limit for direct recruits	Educational and other qualifications required for direct recruits
--------------	--------------	----------------	--------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Chief Conservator of Forests.	1	General Central Service Class I.	Rs. 1800—100—2000.	Selection	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
2. Conservator of Forests.	3	General Central Service Class I.	Rs. 1250—50—1500.	Selection	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
3. Assistant Conservator and Deputy Conservator (Officers drawing pay upto Rs. 500/- a month will be designated as Assistant Conservators and those drawing above as Deputy Conservators).	16	General Central Service Class I	Rs. 350—40—750—EB—40—950—50—1200.	Selection	Between 19 and 24 years on the 1st October of the year in which selected.	<p><i>Essential:</i>  Associateship Diploma of the Forest Research Institute and Colleges, Dehra Dun or equivalent.  Candidates selected for training at Dehra Dun will be required to possess the following educational qualifications :—  At least Second Class degree or Master's Degree in Natural Science, Mathematics, Geology, Mechanical Engineering or Agriculture of a recognised University or equivalent.</p>

## RULE

*Conservators of Forests and Assistant Conservators of Forests, Himachal Pradesh Administration*

Whether age and educational qualifications prescribed for the direct recruits will apply in the case of promotees	Period of probation, if any	Method of recruitment whether by direct recruitment or by promotion or transfer and percentage of the vacancies to be filled by various methods	In case of recruitment by promotion/transfer, grade from which promotion to be made	If a Departmental Promotion Committee exists what is its composition	Circumstances in which U.P.S.C. is to be consulted in making recruitment
8	9	10	11	12	13
Not applicable	Two years	By promotion failing which by transfer on deputation	<i>Promotion</i> Conservator of Forests (with three years service in the grade)  <i>Deputation</i> Officers with about 18 years service in Class I of the Forest Department of Central or State Government or Union Territories out of which about 4 years will be in the post of Conservator	Class I Departmental Promotion Committee	As required under the rules
Not applicable	Two years	Promotion failing which transfer on deputation	<i>Promotion</i> Class I posts of Himachal Pradesh Forest Service with 12 years service in the grade  <i>Transfer or Deputation</i> Suitable Officers of the Forest Service of the Central or State Governments or Union Territories, of the same standing as those eligible for promotion from Class I Himachal Pradesh Forest Service	Class I Departmental Promotion Committee	As required under the rules
Not applicable	Two years	Promotion 25% Direct recruitment 75%	<i>Promotion</i> Officers of the Himachal Pradesh Forest Service Class II with five years service in the grade Rs 0-25-550-25-750. (Candidates recruited direct will have to undergo the requisite training at Forest Research Institute Dehra Dun)	Class I Departmental Promotion Committee	As required under the rules

# **MINISTRY OF HEALTH**

*New Delhi, the 9th January 1963*

**S.O. 168.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 11, clause (a) of sub-rule (2) of rule 14 and sub-rule (1) of rule 23 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957, the President hereby makes the following further amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Health No. S.R.O. 619 dated the 28th February, 1957, namely:—

In the said notification—

1. the existing paragraph (I) shall be renumbered as paragraph (II) and the following paragraph shall be inserted as paragraph (I) namely:—

“(I) in respect of the posts in the General Central Service, Class II, specified in Column I of Part I of the Schedule to this order, the authority specified in Column 2 shall be the Appointing Authority and the authority specified in Column 3 shall be the Disciplinary Authority in regard to the penalties specified in column 4;”

2. in paragraph (II) as renumbered, for the words and figures “Parts I & II” the words and figures “Part II and III” shall be substituted;

3. in the Schedule—

- (i) the existing Part I and Part II shall be renumbered as Part II and Part III respectively and the following Part shall be inserted as Part I, namely:—

## *Part I—General Central Service Class II*

Description of the post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item numbers in rule 13)	Appellate authority	
		Authority	Penalties	
1	2	3	4	5

### **MINISTRY OF HEALTH** **“TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ORGANISATION”**

All posts (Gazetted)	Chairman	Chairman	All
All posts (non-Gazetted)	Director	Director	All

(2) in Part II as renumbered, for the existing headings “Central Regional and Urban Planning Organisation” and “Town Planning Organisation” and the entries relating thereto, the following heading and entries shall be substituted, namely:—

I	2	3	4	5
<b>“TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ORGANISATION”</b>				
All posts	Director	Director	All	Chairman

(3) in Part III as renumbered, for the existing headings “Central Regional and Urban Planning Organisation” and “Town Planning Organisation” and the entries relating thereto, the following heading and entries shall be substituted, namely:—

I	2	3	4	5
<b>“TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ORGANISATION”</b>				
All posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Director.”

[No. F. 16-96/62-L.S.G.]  
A. K. DAR, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 9th January 1963

**S.O. 163.**—The following draft of rules further to amend the Drugs Rules, 1945, which the Central Government, after consultation with the Drugs Technical Advisory Board, propose to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by sections 12 and 33 of the Drugs Act, 1940 (23 of 1940), is published, as required by the said sections for the information of all persons likely to be effected thereby and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th March, 1963.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be considered by the Central Government.

#### Draft Rules

1. These rules may be called the Drugs (Amendment) Rules, 1963.

2. In the Drugs Rules, 1945 (hereinafter referred to as the said rules) for rule 28, the following rule shall be substituted; namely:—

“28. *Duration of import licence.*—An original licence or a renewed licence, unless it is sooner suspended or cancelled, shall be valid up to the 31st December of the year following the year in which it is granted or renewed.”

Provided that if application for a fresh licence is made three months before the expiry of the existing licence the current licence shall be deemed to continue in force until orders are passed on the application.

3. For rule 63, of the said rules, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:

“63. *Duration of licence.*—An original licence or a renewed licence to sell drugs, unless sooner suspended or cancelled, shall be valid up to the 31st December of the year following the year in which it is granted or renewed”.

Provided that if the application for renewal of licence in force is made before its expiry, or if the application is made within one month of its expiry, the licence shall continue to be in force until orders are passed on the application. The licence shall be deemed to have expired if application for its renewal is not made within one month after its expiry.

4. For rule 72 of the said rules, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“72. *Duration of licence.*—An original licence or a renewed licence in Form 25 or in Form 25-B unless sooner suspended or cancelled shall be valid up to the 31st December of the year following the year in which it is granted or renewed.”

Provided that if the application for the renewal of a licence is made before its expiry, or if the application is made within one month of its expiry, after payment of the additional fee, the licence shall continue to be in force until orders are passed on the application. The licence shall be deemed to have expired if the application for its renewal is not made within one month of its expiry.

5. For rule 77, of the said rules, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“77. *Duration of licence.*—An original licence or a renewed licence in Form 28, unless sooner suspended or cancelled shall be valid up to the 31st December of the year following the year in which it is granted or renewed.”

Provided that if the application for the renewal of a licence in force is made before its expiry, or if the application is made within one month of its expiry, after payment of the additional fee, the licence shall continue to be in force until orders are passed on the application. The licence shall be deemed to have expired if the application for its renewal is not made within one month of its expiry.

6. In Schedule A, of the said rules,

(1) in Form 10, for para 2, the following para shall be substituted, namely:

“(2) This is subject to the conditions prescribed in the Drugs Rules, 1945, and shall be in force from . . . . . to . . . . . unless it is sooner suspended or cancelled under the said Rules”;

- (2) in Form 20, for para 2, the following para shall be substituted; namely:  
 "2. The Licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (3) in Form 20-A for para 2, the following para shall be substituted; namely:  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (4) in Form 20-B for para 2, the following para shall be substituted; namely:  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (5) in Form 21, for para 2, the following para shall be substituted, namely:  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (6) in Form 21-A, for para 2, the following shall be substituted; namely:  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (7) in Form 21-B, for para 2, the following para shall be substituted; namely:  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (8) in Form 25, for para 3, the following para shall be substituted, namely:  
 "3 The licence shall be in force from .....to....."
- (9) in Form 25-A, for para 4, the following para shall be substituted; namely:  
 "4. The licence shall be in force from ..... to....."
- (10) in Form 25-B, for para 2, the following para shall be substituted;  
 namely:—  
 "2. The licence shall be in force from.....to....."
- (11) in Form 26, in para 1 for the words "has been renewed for a period of two years from the....." the following words shall be substituted; namely:—  
 "has been renewed from..... to....."
- (12) in Form 26-A, in para 1, for the words 'has been renewed for a period of two years from the.....', the following words shall be substituted; namely:—  
 "has been renewed from..... to ....."
- (13) in Form 26-B, in para 1, for the words 'has been renewed for a period of two years from the.....' the following words shall be substituted, namely:—  
 "has been renewed from..... to ....."
- (14) in Form 28, for para 4, the following para shall be substituted; namely:—  
 "4. The licence shall be in force from..... to....."
- (15) in Form 28-A, after para 3, the following para shall be inserted; namely:—  
 "3-A. The licence shall be in force from..... to ....."

[No. F. 1-10/62-D.]

A. C. RAY, Under Secy.

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th January 1963

**S.O. 170.**—Whereas the Government of India in the Ministry of Health has, by notification No. 16-8/62-MI, dated the 23rd July, 1962, made in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), recognised the medical qualification "Doctor of Medicine" granted by the University of Philippines for the purposes of the said Act;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government hereby specifies the period of two years with effect from the date of this order or so long as Dr. E. A. Santiago who possesses the said qualification,



continues to work in the Holy Family Hospital Kodarma (Hazaribagh), to which she is attached for the time being for the purposes of teaching, research or charitable work, whichever is shorter, as the period to which the medical practice of the said Dr. E. A. Santiago shall be limited.

[No. F. 16-6/62-MI.]

B. B. L. BHARADWAJ, Under Secy.

## MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT & COMMUNICATIONS

(P. & T. Board)

### CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 7th January 1963*

**S.O. 171.**—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport and Communications (Posts and Telegraphs Board) No. S.O. 3756, dated the 6th December, 1962, in rule 3(i) of the Indian Wireless Telegraphy (Possession) Amendment Rules, 1962, for the word 'in' occurring after 'in rule 2,' read 'the'.

[No. F. 1/99/62-BRL.]

H. N. AGGARWAL,  
Director of Wireless.

## MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

*New Delhi, the 10th January, 1963*

**S.O. 172.**—In pursuance of clause (d) of rule 2 of the Railway Protection Force Rules, 1959, the Central Government hereby notifies that the area covered by the Dandakaranya-Balangir-Kiriburu Railway Projects shall be a Zonal Railway for the purposes of the said Rules.

[No. 62 Security (Spl.)6/14.]

P. C. MATHEW, Secy.

## MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC & DEFENCE COORDINATION

(Department of Supply)

*New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 173.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution and all other powers enabling him in that behalf, the President hereby makes the following rules to amend the Indian Supply Service (Class I) Rules, 1961, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Indian Supply Service (Class I) Rules, Amendment Rules, 1963.

2. In the Indian Supply Service (Class I) Rules, 1961, in rule 4, after the words, figures and brackets "as provided in Rule 15(1) of the Rules", the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

"and that for the post of Additional Director General, Supplies and Disposals, officers with engineering qualifications or technical background only will be considered".

[No. 35/2/61-ESI.]

R. RAJAGOPALAN, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING & REHABILITATION****(Department of Rehabilitation)****(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)***New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 174.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (I) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Gulshan Rai Luthra, Competent Officer Rehabilitation Department, Punjab Government so long as he holds that post, to be an Asstt. Settlement Commissioner in the State of Punjab, for the purpose of performing, in addition to his own duties as Competent Officer, Rehabilitation Department, Punjab Government the functions assigned to an Asstt. Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act, in respect of agricultural lands and shops in any rural area including houses, cattle sheds and vacant sites, if any, in any such area allotted alongwith any such lands and forming part of the Compensation Pool.

[No. F. 3(66)/Land &amp; Rent/(62).]

**S.O. 175.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints all the Additional Deputy Commissioners of the various districts of Punjab to be Additional Settlement Commissioners in that State for the purpose of performing within their respective jurisdiction the functions assigned to an Additional Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act, in respect of agricultural lands in any rural area including houses, cattle sheds and vacant sites, if any, in any such area allotted alongwith any such lands.

[No. 3(69)/L&amp;R/62.]

**M. J. SRIVASTAVA,**  
Settlement Commissioner &  
Ex-Officio Under Secy.

**(Department of Rehabilitation)****(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)****ORDER***New Delhi, the 10th January 1963*

**S.O. 176.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), I, N. P. Dube Chief Settlement Commissioner, hereby delegate to Shri Gulshan Rai Luthra, P.C.S.; Asstt. Settlement Commissioner, Punjab, the powers conferred upon me under Sections 23 and 24 of the said Act for the purpose of passing necessary orders under these Sections in so far as they relate to the custody, management and disposal of property (including agricultural land) in the State of Punjab in a rural area as defined in clause (f) of rule 2 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955, which forms part of the Compensation Pool.

[No. 3(66)/L&amp;R/62.]

**N. P. DUBE,**  
Chief Settlement Commissioner.

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT***New Delhi, the 8th January 1963*

**S.O. 177.**—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that public interest requires that the coal industry should be declared to be a public utility service for the purposes of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility

service for the purposes of the said Act for a period of six months from the date of this notification.

[No F. 1/101/62-LRI.]

*New Delhi, the 14th January 1963*

**S.O 178.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Khas Joyrampur Colliery, Post Office Khas Jeenagora, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD.**

**REFERENCE No 17 OF 1962**

In the matter of a Reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (XIV of 47)

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to the Khas Joyrampur Colliery, Post Office Khas Jeenagora, District Dhanbad

**AND**

Their workmen

**PRESENT** Shri Raj Kishore Prasad, M A, B L —*Presiding Officer*

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the Employers* Shri S S Mukherjea, Advocate, Dhanbad

*For the Workmen* Shri Sankar Bose, Member, Central Executive Committee, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

*Dhanbad, dated the 21st December, 1962.*

**State: BIHAR.**

**Industry: COAL.**

### **AWARD**

1 This reference, under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 47), has been made by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, by its Order No 2/58/62-LRII, dated the 28th June 1962 to this Tribunal, for its adjudication of the following industrial dispute:

**“Whether the management of Khas Joyrampur Colliery, Post Office Khas Jeenagora, District Dhanbad were justified in stopping Shri Amin Khan Dresser from work from the 20th April 1962. If not, to what relief is he entitled?”.**

2 The management filed its written statement on 20th July 1962 and the workman filed his written statement of demands on 6th December 1962.

3 Shri S S Mukherjea, Advocate, appearing for the management contended that the action of the management was justified on the facts of the present case and was in accordance with the Standing Order No 11, Exhibit. M 7

4 Shri Sankar Bose, appearing for the workman, however, contended that the standing order No 11 had not been contravened by the workman and as such the management was not justified in stopping the workman, Amin Khan, from work from the 20th April, 1962

5 On the arguments presented before this Tribunal by both parties, therefore, the crucial question for determination is, whether the Standing Order No 11 has been contravened? Before however, I read Standing Order No 11, it is necessary to state the facts of the case which are as herein below.

6 The workman, Amin Khan, was working as a Dresser in the Khas Joyrampur Colliery in question. He was granted leave from 7th March 1962 to 6th April 1962. On 5th April 1962, a day before the expiry of the leave, a telegram, Exhibit M-4, was received by the management from the workman, Amin Khan, saying “Still ill pray extension leave till 21st April” In reply to this telegram, the Manager of the company sent a letter, Exhibit M on 9th April 1962 to the workman, Amin Khan

asking him to send a medical certificate of a Civil Surgeon of a Government hospital recommending leave; otherwise he should join his duty immediately. The workman, Amin Khan, however, neither produced any medical certificate of the Civil Surgeon or any other medical certificate nor reported himself for duty till prior to 20th April 1962. On 20th April 1962, a Medical Certificate of fitness granted by the Civil Surgeon, Monghyr, Exhibit M-1, was produced by the workman, Amin Khan, in which the Civil Surgeon stated that Amin Khan appeared before him on 19th April 1962 and on examination he found him fit to resume his duties. This medical certificate, (Exhibit M-1) granted on 19th April 1962, was produced before the management on 20th April 1962 by Amin Khan who appeared in person on that day in the Colliery. This medical certificate, (Exhibit M-1), however, did not mention anything about the illness or about the period of the workman's alleged illness. Two days later on 22nd April 1962, Amin Khan produced a medical certificate, Exhibit M-2, from Dr. M. Shabuddin, L.M.F., Medical Officer, Narayanpur Dispensary, Bhagalpur, dated 17th April 1962, in which it was said by the Doctor that Amin Khan was under his treatment since the 2nd April 1962 for Lumbago and Nausitlas and that he examined him on 17th April 1962 and found he had recovered and become fit to resume his duty. Further two days later on 24th April 1962, Amin Khan, produced another medical certificate, Exhibit M-3, from Dr. Jagdish Chandra Das L.M.F., of Monghyr, granted to him on 18th April 1962, in which the Doctor said that Amin Khan had been suffering from sciatica with fever and was under his treatment from 28th March 1962 to 17th April 1962, but now he is improved. As the nature of the alleged illness of Amin Khan was different in the two medical certificates Exhibits M-2 and M-3, the story of the alleged illness of Amin Khan was not accepted by the management, and, therefore, as the workman did not return within 8 days of the expiry of his leave originally granted and submit satisfactory explanation to the satisfaction of the Manager of his inability to return to duty on the expiry of his leave, the workman, Amin Khan, in accordance with the terms of Standing Order No. 11, Exhibit M-7, automatically lost lien on his appointment, and, was kept on the *Badli* list, as will appear from the *Badli* Register for 1962, Exhibit M-6.

7. On behalf of the workman, it was submitted by Sri Sankar Bose that in view of the fact that the workman had produced a medical certificate of fitness from the Civil Surgeon, (Exhibit M.1), there had been no contravention of Standing Order No. 11, and, therefore there was no justification on the part of the management in stopping the workman concerned, Amin Khan, from working as a Dresser with effect from the 20th April 1962, when he reported himself for duty in the Colliery, and, accordingly, the action of the management should be held to be unjustified and illegal, and, the workman should be reinstated as dresser with full back wages.

8. The material portion of the Standing Order No. 11 (Exhibit M.7) reads thus:

"Any direct employee of the Company other than a miner or loader who desires to obtain leave of absence shall apply in writing to the head of his department or the Manager of the colliery. \* \* \* If the employee remains absent beyond the period of leave originally granted or subsequently extended he shall lose his lien on his appointment unless:

- (i) he returns within 8 days of the expiry of the leave, and
- (ii) gives an explanation to the satisfaction of the Manager of his inability to return before the expiry of leave. In case the employee loses his lien on the appointment he shall be entitled to be kept on the '*Badli*' list."

\* \* \* \* \*

9. On the plain language of Standing Order No. 11, quoted above, it is clear beyond doubt that a direct employee of the company, other than a miner or a loader who remains absent beyond the period of leave originally granted or subsequently extended he shall lose his lien on his appointment unless (i) he returns within eight days of the expiry of the leave, and, (ii) gives an explanation to the satisfaction of the Manager of his inability to return before the expiry of his leave, and that, if the above two conditions are not satisfied, the workman who automatically loses his lien on his appointment, thereafter is entitled only to be kept on the *Badli* list.

10. In view of this Standing Order No. 11, on the facts of the present case, there is no doubt that the management was justified in stopping the workman, Amin Khan, from working from 20th April 1962. The two medical certificates Exhibits M-2 and M-3 are really very suspicious and had rightly been rejected as worthless by the management. It is worthy to note that in the first medical certificate, Exhibit M-2, granted by the Bhagalpur Doctor, it is said that Amin Khan was under

his treatment from 2nd April 1962 to the date of his re-examination on 17th April 1962, and, that he was having treatment for Lumbago and Nausitias under him. But in the medical certificate granted by the Monghyr doctor, Exhibit M-1, it is said that Amin Khan was suffering from Sclaticea with fever and was under his treatment from 28th March 1962 to 17th April 1962. The period 2nd April 1962 to 17th April 1962 is, therefore, over-lapping as it is mentioned in both the certificates. The nature of the disease mentioned by the two doctors and the over-lapping period do create a legitimate suspicion in the mind of any reasonable man that these two certificates are unreliable and as such could not be acted upon. In my opinion, therefore, the management was justified in ignoring these two medical certificates, and in not accepting them as satisfactory explanation of the workman's inability to return to duty before the expiry of his leave. The Civil Surgeon's certificate is only about the fitness of Amin Khan to resume his duty and it is not in respect of his illness or his disease or the period of his illness. On the foregoing facts, therefore, the position is that admittedly Amin Khan had not return to duty within 8 days of the expiry of his leave on 7th April 1962. He should have returned and reported himself for duty by 15th April 1962, but, admittedly he did not do so nor did he give any explanation to the satisfaction of the Manager. In these circumstances, Amin Khan, who admittedly reported for duty on 20th April 1962, could not possibly be allowed to work in view of Standing Order No. 11.

11. I, therefore, accept the contention of the management and reject that of the workman, and hold that the workman, Amin Khan, contravened Standing Order No. 11. and, therefore, the action of the management being in terms of this Standing Order No. 11, was perfectly legal and justified and within its powers.

12. For the reasons given above, I hold that the management was justified in stopping the workman, Amin Khan, Dresser, from work from the 20th April, 1962, and, therefore, he is not entitled to any relief. His name, in terms of Standing Order No. 11 has been put on the *Badli* list, and, therefore, he will get work when a vacancy of a Dresser will take place in the Colliery. For this, the workman himself is to be blamed.

13. I direct that the parties do bear their own costs.

14. This is my award which I submit to the Government of India under Section 15 of the Act.

Dhanbad, the 21st December 1962.

(Sd.) RAJ KISHORE PRASAD.

[No. 2/58/62-LRII.]

**S.O. 179.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Jogta Colliery and their workmen.

#### CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHABAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (XIV of 47).

REFERENCE No. 18 OF 1962

#### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Jogta colliery

AND

The workmen, Shri Sekho Singh and 11 others, Trammers.

#### PRESENT:

Sri Raj Kishore Prasad, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCES:

*For the Employers:* Shri S. S. Mukherjea, Advocate, Dhanbad.

*For the Workmen:* Shri Sankar Bose, Member, Central Executive Committee, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

State: BIHAR.

Industry: COAL.

Dhanbad, the 22nd December, 1962

## AWARD

1. The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment, by its Order No. 2/54/62-LRII, dated the 29th June 1962, has referred, under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the following industrial dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

"1. Whether the management of the Jogta Colliery was competent under the terms of the employment, to offer alternative employment to the workmen named in the Table? If so, was the employment which was offered to the workmen suitable alternative employment?"

2. What relief, if any, are the workmen entitled?

1. Shri Sekho Singh
2. Shri Dowarik Gope.
3. Shri Kamta Bhor.
4. Shri Baso Oron.
5. Shri Gajo Rajwar.
6. Shri Lohari Gope.
7. Shri Ramsaran Mahato.
8. Shri Gulal Bhula.
9. Shri Sitabal Bhula.
10. Shri Kuber Bhor.
11. Shri Ramesher Mahto.
12. Sri Bipat Kairi."

2. Out of the above twelve workmen, five of them, namely, Shri Baso Oron (4); Shri Gajo Rajwar (5); Shri Gulam Bhula (8); Shri Sitabal Bhula (9) and Shri Ramesher Mahto (11) have withdrawn their cases. Without, therefore, raising any objection regarding the result of the withdrawal of these workmen on the reference itself or on the question whether they could withdraw, it was agreed between Sri Mukherjee, Advocate, who appeared for the management, and Sri Sankar Bose, who appeared for the workmen, that the reference should be decided only with respect to the remaining seven workmen, namely, Shri Sekho Singh (1); Shri Dowarik Gope (2); Shri Kamta Bhor (3); Shri Lohari Gope (6); Shri Ramsaran Mahato (7); Shri Kuber Bhor (10); and Shri Bipat Kairi (12). We are, accordingly, concerned only with these seven workmen, and, as such, on the mutual agreement of the parties I shall consider the case of these seven workmen only who have not withdrawn their cases.

3. On the reference quoted above, three points arise for decision, namely, (1) Whether the company was competent under the terms of employment to offer alternative employment to the workmen concerned; (2) if so, whether the alternative employment of a miner's job offered to these workmen who were working as trammers was suitable; and, (3) if not to what relief, if any, the workmen were entitled.

4. The management filed its written statement on 31st July, 1962 and the workmen filed their statements of claim on 17th September, 1962.

5. The case of the management in their written statement was that these workmen were originally appointed as miners and were working as miners in the Jogta Colliery; that in 1957 they along with several others who are not concerned in the present dispute, [except Bipat Kairi (12), made applications, Exhibits M to M-3 to the Manager of the colliery offering themselves for the post of Trammers, but agreeing to work as miners/loaders if for any reason at any time their services of Trammers were not required by the management; that the management accepted the above undertakings and allowed them to work as Trammers; that, subsequently, due to shortage of work faces, the mining operation in the 11 Seam West was closed due to fire therein in September 1961, and, therefore, the management "adopted various methods to deal with the original trammers employed therein, namely, compulsory leave, lay-off or employment in short term vacancies, but this type of dealing with the trammers was no longer possible," and, as such, the management decided to transfer these workmen including others as miners in terms of their undertakings, given before, and to retain the original trammers in their substantive posts of trammers. Such workmen were 24 in number, and out of them, 13 submitted their resignations and the 11 workmen, concerned in the present dispute, were offered alternative jobs of miners according to their agreements Exhibits M to M-3, which was considered suitable alternative employment, because they had previously worked as miners, but they

refused. The management, therefore, maintained that the alternative employment of miners offered to these workmen were suitable alternative appointments.

6. The workmen, however, in their written statement, said that they (Nos. 1 to 11) were ordered to work as miners with effect from 4th April 1962 but No. 12 Bipat Kairi was asked to work as a miner from 23rd April, 1962; that when they got notices of the same, Exhibits M-4 to M-7, they protested by a joint petition on 10th April, 1962 Exhibit M-5 on the grounds, firstly, that a miner's job was not a suitable alternative job for them, and, secondly, that the management have been engaging new hands for the trammers job, and, therefore, the order issued by the Manager, such as Exhibits M-4 and M-7, to them was not justified; that if they were surplus to requirements the management was free to retrench them in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act Section 25F but the miner's job offered to these workmen cannot be considered suitable alternative job, in as much as they as trammers will get wages on time-rate basis on the basis of attendance, whereas, a miner gets wages on the basis of piece rate and, therefore, the action of the management in stopping the workmen Nos. 1 to 11 from working from 4th April, and the workmen No. 12 from working from 23rd April was illegal and unjustified, and, accordingly they should be reinstated with full back wages, and other allowances.

7. The management examined Sri S. Ghoshal, Bonus Clerk of Jogta Colliery, M.W.1, and, Shri S. B. Ashtikar, Manager of the Colliery, M.W.2, as their witnesses. The workmen also examined Kuber Bhor (No. 10) W.W.1 as a witness on their behalf.

8. As regards the first question, regarding the competency of the management to offer alternate employment to these workmen, Shri Bose did not challenge it seriously and did not contend that the management was not competent to offer suitable alternative employment to these workmen. The first question, therefore, must be answered in the affirmative.

9. Shri Bose, however, seriously argued that the alternative employment of a Miner's job offered to these men, who were previously working as underground trammers, was not at all a suitable alternative employment for these workmen, and, therefore, the miner's job could not be considered a suitable alternative employment. The crucial question, therefore, is whether this alternative job of a miner offered to these workmen can be considered for them to be a suitable alternative employment?

10. In order to prove that these workmen, concerned in the present reference, were working before as miners, but later, at their own request, they were transferred to work as trammers, the management examined its Bonus Clerk, M.W.1, who stated that these workmen used to work before as miners but later at their own request they were transferred to work as trammers and he proved the applications made by these workmen, (except No. 12), Exhibits M to M-3, and, also filed Bonus Registers, Exhibits M-8 to M-11, in order to show that these workmen were working before as miners before they were transferred as trammers, and also stated that Seam No. 1 in the colliery was closed since September 1961. The workmen's witness, W.W.1, however, gave reasons why a miner's job was not a suitable alternative job for a trammer.

11. I will now deal first with the applications, Exhibits M to M-3, made by the six workmen Nos. 1 to 3, 6, 7 and 10.

*Exhibit M* is an application made to the Manager on 22nd February 1957 by several workmen, including *Sekho Singh* (No. 1). In this application, it is mentioned that these applicants had learnt that some trammers for 11 Seam were going to be appointed, and, therefore, they were applying for being appointed as such trammers. They further gave the following undertaking:

"We give you the solemn undertaking that we shall work as miners/loaders if any time and for any reason our services as trammers are not required by the management and for this the management shall not be required to assign any reason."

*Exhibit M-1* is a similar application made by several workmen, including *Sri Doward Gope* (No. 2) and *Kamta Bhor* (No. 3). This application was made on 30th October, 1957 to the Manager and is in almost similar terms.

*Exhibit M-2* is also in similar terms and was made on 12th November, 1957 by three workmen including *Lohari Gope* (6).

Exhibit M-3 is an application made by 21 workmen in similar terms and amongst the 21 applicants are Kuber Bhor (10), W.W.1, and Ram Saran Mahto (7).

Bipat Kairi (12), however, is not one of the applicants in any of these applications, Exhibits M to M-3, but it will appear from the Bonus Register, Exhibit M-8, that he also worked previously as miner.

It is, therefore, proved beyond doubt that all these seven workmen, with whom we are concerned, worked previously as miners, and, therefore, they were allowed to work as trammers. It is further plain that six of them mentioned before, with whom we are concerned were allowed to work as trammers subsequently on their own applications Exhibits M to M-3. The fact that Bipat Kairi (No. 12) was allowed to work as a trammer although he gave no undertaking or made no application similar to Exhibits M to M-3 clearly goes to prove that the undertakings given by the six workmen concerned in Exhibits M to M-3 were not the basis of their employments.

12. In the above connection, Shri Mukherjea, appearing for the management, relied on a decision of Mr. Justice N. G. Oak, of the Allahabad High Court, in *Messrs. J. K. Cotton Manufacturers Limited Versus J. N. Tewari*, A.I.R. 1959 All 639, for the proposition that it is open to an employer to employ and enter into a special contract with him beyond the standing orders and if there is a conflict between the said terms in a special contract and the standing orders, the terms of the said special contract will prevail. Shri Mukherjea, therefore, contended that the applications of these workmen, Exhibits M to M-3 constituted a Special Contract between the parties and, as such, they were binding on the workmen. A Division Bench of the Patna High Court, however, in *Bihar Journals Limited Vs. Ali Hasan*, 1959-II-L.L.J. 536, has held that the certified standing orders have statutory force and parties cannot in law enter into a contract over-riding the statutory contract as embodied in certified standing orders, and, therefore, any contract contrary to such standing orders must be ignored.

13. Shri Bose contended, on behalf of the workmen, that although genuineness of Exhibits M to M-3, were not denied by the workmen but they were mere applications for jobs and not agreements at all and, therefore, the alleged undertakings given in those applications by these workmen cannot be considered to be terms and conditions of their service and accordingly they, being permanent employees of the Colliery under Standing Order No. 1(g), Exhibit M-12, cannot be offered a miner's job when they were working before as underground trammers.

14. On 10th April, 1962 these workmen made a joint application Exhibit M-5 to the Manager, as stated before, and stated therein that in their opinion there was ample scope for employing them as trammers and they should be allowed to continue as trammers, but, in case trammers job was not available for all of them, they should be retrenched according to the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act. In reply, to the said letter Exhibit M-5, the Manager of the Colliery sent a letter, Exhibit M-6, on 24th April, 1962 saying that the alternative employment in the category of miners was as per their undertakings, and, therefore, their refusal to work as a miner was a breach of the undertaking and that there is no scope for their employment as trammers and as such they must report as miners not later than 27th April 1962, although they have been marked absent from 4th April, 1962. A similar letter, Exhibit M-7, was sent on 20th March, 1962 earlier to Bipat Kairi (No. 12). M.W.2 has denied the workmen's allegation that new trammers are being appointed as alleged by W.W.1. It is true that no one from amongst the alleged newly appointed trammers was examined on behalf of the workmen. But it is important to note, as will appear from Exhibit W-1, the Failure Report dated 16th May, 1962, that the management accepted impliedly and indirectly before the Conciliation Officer (Central) that the allegation of the workmen that "even now miners are working as trammers and as such the workmen in dispute could not said to be surplus, in their category by any stretch of imagination....." might be a fact; miners were being asked to work as trammers in short term vacancies."

Obviously, therefore, the case of the management now before the Tribunal that there was no scope for these workmen being employed or allowed to continue to work as trammers because of the closure of 11 Seam in the colliery due to fire is untrue and only a pretext for not keeping these seven workmen in their jobs as trammers. The statement of Kuber Bhor, W.W.1, that since these workmen have been made idle, many new trammers have been engaged by the management must, therefore be accepted as true. The management has not produced all the appointment registers of all its employees to show that really since April, 1962 it has not employed any new trammer at all. The Report of the



Conciliation Officer, Exhibit W.1, supports fully the case of these workmen. I, therefore, hold that these seven workmen concerned in the present dispute have illegally been not allowed to work as trammers, and, offered miners' jobs just to get rid of them.

15. It is not denied that these workmen were working before as miners and thereafter they were employed to work as trammers. This fact could not possibly be denied, because the documents, Exhibits M to M-11, filed on behalf of the management, prove beyond doubt that these workmen were working as miners and subsequently they were taken in as trammers.

16. To me, however, it appears that a miners' job is not a suitable alternative job for a trammer, because the nature of their work and their wages are entirely different. On this point the evidence of Kuber Bhor (10) W.W.1, which has not been challenged by the management as untrue, is important. He has said: "A trammer will not accept the work of a miner. A trammer will get wages on time rated basis on the basis of attendance while the miner will get wages on the basis of piece rate. A trammer gets Rs. 18-As. 13 as his wages in six days after deduction of Provident Fund but a miner will get Rs. 17 or Rs. 18 as his wages in 6 days if he gets one tub per day." The fact that a miner's job and wages are different from those of a trammer was also not disputed by the management. The only contention put forward on behalf of the management, in justification of its action, was that in the case of these workmen, because they previously worked as miners and subsequently they were allowed to work as trammers on their own, undertaking, the miner's job should be considered to be a suitable alternative job for these workmen.

I am unable to accept the contention that these applications, Exhibits M to M-3, should be considered as contracts. Simply because they contain undertakings given by these workmen, they cannot be considered to be contracts at all. The management has not filed the appointment letters of these workmen to show that their undertakings really were the basis and that they were the real terms and conditions of their employments and if these workmen had not given these undertakings, they would not have been employed as trammers at all. The management needed trammers, and, therefore, undertakings or no undertakings, these workmen, who were then working as miners, would have been taken as trammers.

I, therefore, hold that Exhibits M to M-3 do not constitute contracts and that the undertaking given by these workmen in these applications, did not constitute their terms and conditions of their employment.

17. These workmen were in service, on the evidence of the Bonus Clerk M.W.1, since 1956 or 1957. On the evidence of W.W.1 these workmen had 7 years' service, 5 years as trammers and previously for two years as miners. There is, therefore, no doubt that these workmen have been in continuous service of the company for not less than one year. Under Standing Order No. 1(g) these workmen, who were appointed for an unlimited period, must be considered to be permanent employees as contended by Shri Bose. If these workmen were surplus to requirements as deposed to by M.W.2, these workmen should have been retrenched in the manner provided by Section 25F of the Act, but this was not done on the ground that they have been offered suitable alternative employments.

18. In view of these considerations, I hold that the alternative job of a miner, which was offered to these workmen, who were working before for several years as trammers, cannot be considered to be a suitable alternative employment, in spite of the fact that long before they had worked as miners also.

19. On my above finding, these seven workmen are entitled to be reinstated as trammers with effect from the date from when they have been stopped from working, with full back wages, allowances, bonus and other emoluments, which they would have been entitled to, as if they had been in employment all along.

20. These directions must be implemented within one month from the date when the award becomes enforceable under Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. There will be, however, no order for costs.

21. This is my award which I submit to the Central Government under Section 15 of the Act.

(Sd.) RAJ KISHORE PRASAD.

Dhanbad 22nd December, 1962.

[No. 2/54/62-LRII.]

**S.O. 180.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Sijua Colliery and their workmen.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a Reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 12 OF 1962

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to Sijua Colliery,

AND

Their Workmen, miners of Sijua Colliery.

**PRESENT:**

Shri Raj Kishore Prasad, M.A., B.L.—*Presiding Officer.*

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the Employers.*—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate, Dhanbad, with Shri G. Prasad, Chief Personnel Officer.

*For the Workmen.*—Shri D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate, Calcutta, with Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate, Dhanbad, Shri S. Das Gupta, Secretary, and Shri Shankar Bose, Member, Central Executive Committee, Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE: Bihar,

INDUSTRY: Coal.

*Dhanbad, dated the 31st December, 1962*

**AWARD**

1. Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, by its Order No. 1/2/62-LRII, dated the 7th April, 1962, referred, under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (XIV of 47), for adjudication by this Tribunal, the following industrial dispute:

“Whether the reduction in rate paid to the miners of Sijua colliery from 1st August, 1961, is justified and proper, and, if not, to what relief they are entitled.”

2. The Workmen filed their written statement of their claim on 3rd May, 1962, whereas, the Employers filed their written statement on 2nd June, 1962.

3. On the reference, therefore, only two questions arise for determination, namely, (i) whether the reduction in the rate paid to the workmen concerned from the 1st August, 1961, is justified?, and, (ii) If this first question is answered in the negative, then to what relief they are entitled?

4. In order to decide the first question, namely, whether the management was justified in reducing the rate which the workmen were admittedly getting before 1st August, 1961, it is necessary first to know the nature of the work done by these workmen before and after 1st August, 1961, and also the wages which they were getting before, and, which they were offered now.

5. According to the management, the workmen concerned in the present dispute were *Loaders* and, therefore, they were getting *Loaders' rate*, whereas, according to the workmen they were *C.P. Miners*, and therefore, they claimed *C.P. Miners' rate*. Admittedly these workers prior to 1st August, 1961, were getting *hand-cut-rate* which is also called *Pick Miners' rate*. In order to understand the difference between a *Loader*, a *C.P. Miner* and a *Pick-Miner*, it is necessary to know the nature of the duty performed by each of them and the workload and wages of each of them.

6. There is, however, no dispute between the parties regarding the nature of the work of a *Pick Miner*, *C. P. Miner* and *Loader*, and, also regarding their *Work Loads* and *Wages*, fixed by the All India Industrial Tribunal (Colliery Disputes) known as Majumdar Award or Coal Award as modified on appeal by the Labour Appellate Tribunal in the Collieries Appeals on 29th January, 1957.

*Pick Miner:*

7. Pick Miners' job is to cut with his pick the coal from the solid face and to load it in the tub. The work-load of a pick-miner has been fixed at one tub of 36 c.ft. for working for 8 hours, and, the rate at which he is paid is Rs. 3/-/8 pies per tub which includes Basic plus Dearness Allowance. This rate includes wages both for cutting and loading coal. This will be found in Para 584 of the Coal Award read with Para 103 of the Labour Appellate Tribunal's decision. A Pick Miner's rate is also, as stated earlier, called Hand Cut rate.

*C.P. Miner:*

8. C.P. Miner's job is to drill holes with a crow bar into the solid face and they are generally engaged in de-pillaring area. Into the holes thus drilled by them explosives are stemmed and are fired by shot-firers and when the coal is blasted these C.P. Miners dress the sides and roofs and load the blasted coals thus obtained into tubs. Their work-load for 8 hours has been fixed at 1-1/3 tub of 36 c.ft. Their rate of wages is Rs. 2/5/3 pies Basic plus Dearness Allowance per tub which comes to Rs. 3/1/8 pies for 1-1/3 tubs. This will be found in para 589 of the Coal Award read with Paragraphs 106 and 116 of Labour Appellate Tribunal's decision.

*Loader:*

9. The duty of a loader is only to load the blasted coal mechanically obtained into tubs, and their work-load is two tubs of 36 c.ft. in 8 hours, and their rate of wages is Rs. 1/8/4 pies per tub, including Basic and Dearness Allowance, and, therefore, the total earning of a loader per day is Rs. 3/-/8 pies. This will be found in Para 587 and 588 of the Coal Award read with Paras 126 and 141 of the Labour Appellate Tribunal's decision.

10. It will thus be seen from the above that although the duties of a Pick Miner and a Loader are a little different, the work of a Pick Miner being more than that of a loader, but their daily earnings as wages are the same, namely, Rs. 3/-/8 pies per day. It is, however, admitted by both sides (i) that these workmen concerned were not Pick Miners out and out, and, (ii) that they were getting hand-cut rates prior to August 1961.

11. Let us now see what is the case of the parties about the nature of the work done by these workmen before and after August 1961 and about the wages they were getting before and were offered after August 1961. We are here concerned with 16 Seam, West and East sections, of the Sijua colliery.

12. *Management's care.*—According to the management, (a) These workmen concerned were working prior to August 1961 in 16 Seam West, but from the 1st August 1961 most of them were shifted to 16 Seam East for obtaining coal under a different mode and a different method of work and that when these workers were working in 16 Seam West they were paid Hand Cut rates, but when they were removed to 16 Seam East they were offered and paid Loaders' rate plus Rs. 0.22 basic rate, which came to Rs. 0.54 nP;

(b) *Before August 1961*, these workmen were drilling holes with crow bars, then these drilled holes were stemmed with explosives and then shots were fired by shot firers, and, thereafter sides and roofs were dressed and then the coal thus obtained was loaded into tubs.

E.W. 1. Shri Ramrath Sharma, who was the Agent of Sijua Group of Collieries from 1st March, 1958 to 31st March, 1962 and who is now the Deputy Chief Mining Engineer, further said on the question of the nature of work done by these workmen, that prior to August, 1961, coal from this West section was obtained by de-pillaring and caving was practised and the blasting operation in 16 seam West was very limited and as the blasting was limited, the coal obtained was not much, and, therefore, these workmen had also to use pick for getting more coal for loading into the tubs and due to this hand-cut coal they were paid hand cut rates;

(c) *After August 1961*. Electric Drills and stowing operations were introduced in 16 Seam East Section and one *drilling Mazdoor*, who was paid Sarkari (i.e. departmentally) was employed in each shift to help and assist the miners in drilling holes and, therefore, after August 1961, the work done by these workmen was drilling holes by electric drills, stemming these holes by explosives, firing shots by shot firers, dressing the sides and the roof and loading the blasted coal into tubs, and, they were being paid Loader's rate as per the Coal Award.

together with 54 nP. Basic and dearness allowance per tub for doing the extra work of drilling and dressing.

E.W. 1, Shri Ramnath Sharma, further said that after August 1961, when the caving Section of the West side was exhausted, a new Section in the same Seam on East side was opened and depillaring was started in conjunction with hydraulic stowing and since this method permitted intensive blasting, drilling with the electric drill was introduced, and, that if drilling and dressing are done Sarkari, then the management will require the services of one driller, one Drilling Mazdoor and two dressers per shift and in that case the management had to pay Rs. 14.05 nP. for these persons because the Coal Award has put a driller in category IV and his wage, all inclusive, is Rs. 4.51; a drilling Mazdoor has been put in Category II and his wage is Rs. 3.24 nP. and a Dresser has been put in Category VI and his wage is Rs. 6.65 nP. and, therefore, for two dressers the management has to spend Rs. 7.30 nP. and, therefore, for one Drilling Mazdoor, one Driller and two dressers the company has to spend Rs. 14.05 nP. and, if these things, namely, drilling and dressing are done Sarkari, the workmen will be left with loading only and consequently the management offered them leaders' rate

E.W. 1 further said that this contingent of dressers, drillers and drilling Mazdoors will give an output of 30 tubs, and, therefore, the company will have to spend 0.47 nP. per tub, which would come to Rs. 14.05 nP. for all these persons, as stated earlier, and, accordingly, the company offered, instead of 0.47 nP. per tub, 0.54 nP. per tub for drilling and dressing, simply because in the company's neighbouring colliery—Bhelatand—0.54 nP. was being paid to workmen doing similar job; and

(d) Thus the work of these workmen was, much less than before, and, therefore, their pre-August 1961 wages were reduced, and, therefore, these workmen were also paid 0.54 nP. instead of 0.47 nP.

13. *Workmen's case.*—The case of the workmen, however, is that the nature of the work of these workers was the same as before, and, therefore, there was no justification for reduction in the rate of wages which were being paid to these workmen prior to August 1961.

Their case was that when crow bar was used more coal was obtained, and, therefore, more tubs were filled with coal, and the workmen get more wages but with the introduction of electric drilling less coal is obtained, and, therefore, this system is of no advantage to the miners and loaders. Their further case is that the existing privileges have been protected and kept in tact by the Coal Award and as such the management has no right to vary or change them, and, that the Miners have to cut coal in the present system as in the past, and, therefore, there is no question of giving these workmen Machine Cut coal rate. It may be mentioned that admittedly Machine Cut has not been introduced in 16 seam de-pillaring section either East or West. The workmen, therefore, prayed that they should be paid Pick Miners' rate and not Loaders rate.

14. Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate, on behalf of the management, examined, in support of its case, Shri Ram Narain Sharma, Deputy Chief Mining Engineer, E.W. 1, and, Shri A. N. Acharya, Assistant Manager of 16 Seam Digwadih Colliery, where he was transferred from Sijua Colliery on 1st August 1962, E.W. 2, and, also filed on 13th December 1962 a Chart mentioning the work performed by these miners in 16 Seam West Section de-pillaring area before August 1961 and the work performed by these miners in 16 Seam East Section de-pillaring area after August 1961.

15. It would be useful to reproduce here the said Chart *in extenso*. It is as below:—

Work performed by miners in 16 Seam West Section de-pillaring area, Sijua Colliery, before August, 1961.	Work performed by miners in 16 Seam East Section de-pillaring area, Sijua Colliery, after August, 1961.
1. The miners themselves used to drill holes by crow bars.	1. The miners are blasted coal loaders.
2. Explosives were stemmed in the holes and then blasted by shot firers.	2. One or two out of the gang of loaders with the assistance of the driller mazdoor drill holes by electric drills.

Work performed by miners in 16 Seam West Section de-pillaring area, Sijua Colliery, before August, 1961.

Work performed by miners in 16 Seam East Section de-pillaring area, Sijua Colliery, after August, 1961.

3. After blasting, the loose coals were dressed by these miners by picks and crow bars.
4. The use of pick was more and so the explosive consumed per ton of coal was less.
5. The coal cut by picks along with the blasted coal was loaded into coal tubs.
6. The miners were paid the hand cut rate.

3. After the holes are blasted, the coal is dressed by the miners, loaders and loaded into coal tubs.
4. They do not have to cut the coal by picks but they dress the loose coal by crow bars or picks.
5. The use of pick was less and so the explosive consumed per ton of coal was more.
6. Since the coal is mechanically obtained, loaders rate is paid. For the performance of additional work of using the electric drill along with the Departmental Mazdoors and also dressing as additional rate of 22 nP. basic per tub is paid."

16. The management also produced papers Exhibits E to E-3 in order to show the consumption of explosives in the month of October 1962 (Exhibit E); from 29th June 1960 to 25th October 1962 (Ex. E, 1) and for October 1960 Exhibits E-2 and E-3, and, also registers, Exhibits E-4 to E-21 showing the explosives consumption in the West and the East Section of Seam No. 16 in support of its case that when the use of pick was more, the explosive consumed per ton was less, but now after August 1961, when the use of pick was less, the explosive consumed per ton of coal was more.

17. Shri D. L. Sen Gupta, Advocate, appearing for the workmen, also examined four witnesses, namely, Shri Gokul Nand Singh, a Store Keeper of Sijua Colliery, W.W. 1; Shri A. Dutta, Overman in Sijua Colliery, W.W. 2; Sri J. N. Biswas, Mining Sirdar, Sijua Colliery working in 15 Seam, W.W. 3; and Sri M. Dusadh, Miner working in 16 Seam of Sijua Colliery, W.W. 4; and also filed three Charts, two of which are marked Exhibits W. and W-1, and the third Chart was filed in support of his argument based on the evidence of the two witnesses E.W. 1 and E.W. 2 examined on behalf of the management.

18. According to the Workmen, the nature of work done prior to August 1961 and after August 1961 as given in the Chart Exhibit W, (which however is not admitted by the management), is as below:—

"Nature of work done prior to August 1961

Nature of work done after August 1961

About 200 miners and loaders used to work in 3 shifts in the 16 seam West. The miners and loaders used to go down in the mine with their crow bars, picks and baskets. First duty was there to check their working face and dress the loose sides and roof with the help of their crow bar and picks getting on a ladder 14 feet high provided by the company. They then used to drill holes with the crow bars. Then explosives were put in the holes by Sarkari men and blasted by the shot firers. After such blasting the miners and loaders used to get on the ladder and dress the loose hanging coal from the roof and sides. Then they used their picks and cut coal for the purpose of loading.

All the processes of pre-August 1961 remain. Only change is that in place of West Section it is now in East and as in the past, now electric drilling is the method adopted in place of crow bar drilling. Crow bar drilling is often found to be more advantageous as it makes better holes and releases more coal on blasting as the miners know better where the holes should be made and blasting done. The present change is no change at all, it was already there and nothing new. In any case it is no advantage for the miners and loaders.

"Nature of work done prior  
to August 1961

Nature of work done after  
August 1961

Tubs were then loaded. Though this was the usual feature for a long period of time, even during this period at times some changes in the operational method were adopted. In 1954 and 1955 in this very seam the Electric Drilling was introduced and such drilling was done by *Sarkari* men and the place of such Electric Drilling was 11 East Level De-pillaring Section. In Seam No. 15 of this colliery in de-pillaring section electric drill machine was used from 1951 to 1959 by *Sarkari* men.

In all cases, whether the drilling was by crow bar or by the Electric drills, the miners and loaders were paid *pick miners' rate*. They were paid on the basis of tub while the system is that one miner cuts and load two tubs in such system.

Their production has not increased in any way; rates per tub have been reduced and consequently weekly loss in earning for a miner or loader is about Rs. 15/- Old hand cut rate per tub was much higher namely Rs 3 04 nP per tub (Basic pay and DA and underground allowance) than the present rate per tub introduced from 1st August 1961 namely Rs 2 08 nP per tub (Basic pay and DA exclusive of VDA. and underground allowance) which is machine coal loading rate. Bhelatand Colliery conditions and system are irrelevant and different. Here the miners and loaders have had their own wages and systems. It is particularly to be mentioned that the electric drill machine is operated by the miner, themselves and not by *Sarkari* men since 1st August 1961.

N.B.—Machine cut is not introduced in 16 Seam de-pillaring section either West or East. Miners have got to cut coal in the present system as in the past. Hence no question of giving machine cut coal rate does arise. Further the existing privileges are all protected by the Award."

19. The chart supplied by the workmen, Exhibit W 1, gives the rates for one 36 cubic feet tub of coal according to the Coal Award as modified by Labour Appellate Tribunal; the existing position in the Sijua Colliery till July 1961 in Seam No. 16, and, the changes effected since 1st August 1961 which are alleged to be alterations of the existing position to the serious prejudice and loss of the workmen. The wages given in Exhibit W. 1 are as below.—

	Under the Majumdar Award as modified by L.A.T.			Existing position in Sijua colliery till July 1961 in 16 Seam*			Changes effected since 1-8-61 altering the existing position to the serious loss and prejudice of the workmen		
	Basic	DA	Total	Basic	DA	Total	Basic	DA	Total
Under Pick Mining	1 313	1 729	3 042	1 313	1 729	3 042	1 313	1 729	
C.P. Mining system	1 03	1 29	2 32	1 313	1 729	3 042	89	1 19	2 08
Under Machine Cutting system	0 674	0 889	1 563	No machine cutting was ever done.			No machine cutting is done even now.		

\*This condition of 16 Seam was also prevalent in Seam No. 5 all along.

20. The management has filed another chart showing the rates paid to miners of Sijua colliery for loading coal of 16 Seam both *after and before* August, 1961, for one tub of 36 cubic feet and one tub of 40.5 c.ft. The chart is as below:

*After August 1961*

	Tub capacity 36 c.ft.	Tub capacity 40.5 c.ft.
Basic . . . . .	.674 (per tub)	.758 (per tub)
D.A.		
Dearness allowances . . . . .	.880 „	.999 „
U.G. Allowances . . . . . (underground allowance)	.09 „	.10 „
V.D.A. (variable daily allowance) . . . . .	.37 per attendance	.37 per attendance
Drilling . . . . .	.54 per tub	.59 per tub.
	1.654 Breakup for	1.863 Breakup for
	.54	.59
	.22 basic	.24 basic
	.29 D.A.	.32 D.A.
	.03 U.C.	.03 U.C.
	.54	.59

*Before August 1961*

Basic . . . . .	1.313 per tub.	1.477 per tub
D.A. . . . .	1.720 „	1.945 „
U.G. . . . .	0.17 „	0.190 „
	3.20 „	
V.D.A. . . . .	0.37 per attendance	0.37 per attendance
	3.573	3.982

21. With reference to the chart reproduced above in para 20 it may be mentioned that *after August 1961* the admitted rates for one tub of 36 cubic feet, with which really we are concerned here, are the following:—

	For one tub of 36 c.ft.
Basic . . . . .	.67 per tub.
D.A. . . . .	.88 per tub.
U.G.A. . . . .	.09 per tub.
V.D.A. . . . .	.37 per attendance.
	2.184

*The disputed item is for drilling at .54 nP.*

22. It will thus appear, from paras 20 and 21, that before August 1961, these workmen were admittedly getting 3.57, but now they are offered 1.65, which means Rs. 1.92 less than before. If, however, we exclude V.D.A. which is per attendance, we get that before August 1961 the workmen were admittedly getting Rs. 3.20 per tub, whereas, after August, 1961, and after including .54 nP, per tub for drilling, they are now offered Rs. 2.18, and, therefore, they would be getting Rs. 1.02 less than before per tub. This is the real cause of the present dispute between the parties.

23. Shri Sen Gupta, as stated earlier, has prepared a Chart on the basis of the evidence of the two witnesses E.W. 1 and E.W. 2 on behalf of the management, in order to show that the new electric drilling system introduced in 16 Seam East has not increased the *per capita* output in any manner so as to justify

the reduction of rates; rather, as stated by the Miners, their output has fallen, as crow bar drilling releases more coal, and the management's expends for explosives also is now more than before. It would be better to reproduce the material portion of the Chart given to me by Shri Sen Gupta. It reads as follows:—

"Pre August 1961—West	Post August 1961—East
(a) 8 to 10 working faces (E.W. 1). (b) 700 tons average per working face (E.W. 1). (c) 120 to 150 miners at work (E.W. 2).	(a) 4 to 5 working faces (E.W. 1). (b) 1,000 to 1,100 tons average per working face (E.W. 1). (c) 100 to 120 miners at work (E.W. 2).
If we take the mean of 8 and 10 working face as 9, and of 120 and 150 miners at 135, then the output per man comes to 46.6 tons per month.	If we take the mean of 4 and 5 working faces to be 4½ and of 1,000 and 1,100 tons as 1,050 and of 100 men and 120 men at 110 men, the output per man comes to 42.9 ton per month. $(9/2 \text{ working faces} \times 1,050 \text{ tons} = 4,725 \text{ tons} - 4,725 \text{ tons divided by } 110 \text{ miners comes to } 42.9 \text{ tons per month per miner.})$

Therefore, the new electric drilling system has not increased the *per capita* output in any manner so as to justify the reduction of rates; rather as stated by the miners their output has fallen, as crow bar drilling releases more coal. Further, the company's expense for explosives also is now more. In pre-August 1961 (*vide* E.W. 1 at page 3) per pound of explosives 14 to 15 tons of coal was obtained but now only 11 to 12 tons of coal is obtained per pound of explosives."

24 The crucial question, in my opinion, is, whether the nature of the work done by these miners has changed after August 1961 as alleged by the management, which necessitated and justified the reduction in the rate paid to these miners prior to August 1961?

In order to answer this question posed by me, I think it would be better to examine the case put forward by the management itself in order to find out if really there has been any change in the nature of the work done by these miners before and after August 1961.

25. The management's case is given in detail in para 12 above and from that it is clear, in my opinion, that the nature of the work done by these miners has not at all changed. According to the management, the work done by these miners before August 1961, was to drill holes, then these drilled holes were stemmed with explosives, shots were then fired by shot-firers, and then sides and roofs were dressed by these miners and then the coal thus obtained was loaded into tubs, and, even after August 1961 also, these miners have to drill holes, then the drilled holes are stemmed with explosives, and then, shots are fired by the shot-firers, and, thereafter the sides and roofs are dressed by these miners and then the coal thus obtained is loaded into tubs. It will thus be seen that even according to the management these miners are doing the same work after August 1961 which they used to do before August 1961. The only change, however, according to the management, is only in this respect that before August 1961 holes were drilled by the miners with crow bars whereas after August 1961 these holes are drilled by electric drills. This is the change only in the method of drilling. According to the workmen, when the holes were drilled with crow bars more coal was obtained, whereas, after August 1961 when holes are drilled by electric drilling machines less coal is obtained, and, thus, less coal is available for loading into tubs with the result that they now earn less wages. This fact has been deposed to by the witnesses examined on behalf of the workmen. The management, however, makes out a case that with the introduction of electric drilling its financial burden has increased and the physical burden of the workmen has decreased. But, even if that be so, that would not be a justification for reduction in the rate given to these miners which they were getting before August 1961. Simply because now holes are drilled by electric drilling machines which has resulted in more cost being incurred by the management is not a valid ground for demoting these miners to the class of loaders. For these reasons, in my opinion, the management was not justified in reducing



the rate of wages paid to the miners concerned from 1st August 1961, and, as such, they are entitled to hand-cut rates or pick miner's rate even after 1st August 1961 which they were getting before 1st August 1961.

26. There is another aspect of the case also. It will appear from the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal dated 29th January, 1957, Para 351(1), at page 130, that the existing amenities and privileges were to be kept in tact and they were not to be interfered with. There can be no doubt that the rates of wages which these miners were getting before August 1961 were in existence till before July 1961, and, therefore, after August 1961, these existing rates of wages paid to these miners could not be varied to their disadvantage after August 1961 on the ground that the method of drilling has changed resulting in the management incurring more cost than before. On this ground also the reduction by the management after August 1961 in the rate of wages paid to these miners seems to be improper and unjustified.

27. There is still a third ground which has also been very strongly urged on behalf of the workmen, namely, that the management has contravened the mandatory provisions of Section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The material portion of Section 9A, which applies to the present case, is in these terms:

9A. *Notice of change.*—No employer, who proposes to effect any change in the conditions of service applicable to any workman in respect of any matter specified in the Fourth Schedule, shall effect such change—

- (a) without giving to the workmen likely to be affected by such change a notice in the prescribed manner of the nature of the change proposed to be effected; or
- (b) within twenty-one days of giving such notice;

\* \* \* \* \*

The Fourth Schedule, referred to in Section 9A, provides the conditions of service for change of which notice under Section 9A is to be given. The items of such conditions of service on which reliance was placed on behalf of the workmen are contained in Items Nos. 1 and 8 of the said Schedule. Item No. 1 of the Fourth Schedule speaks of 'wages' and Item 8 speaks of "Withdrawal of any customary concession or privilege or change in usage." In my opinion, section 9A applies to the present case, inasmuch as, the conditions of service have been changed because the rates of wages which the workmen concerned in the present dispute, were getting before August 1961 have been changed without any notice to them and this the management could not legally do. I am unable to accept the argument of the management that Section 9A does not apply to the facts of the present case. I, therefore, hold that there has been a contravention of the mandatory provisions of Section 9A, read with items 1 and 8 of the Fourth Schedule of the Act, and, therefore, the reductions in the rates of wages paid to these miners before 1st August 1961 by the management after 1st August 1961 are illegal on this ground also.

28. For these considerations, I answer the reference by holding that the reduction in the rate paid to the miners of Sijua Colliery from 1st August, 1961, by the management is not justified and proper and legal, and, therefore, these miners, who are concerned in the present dispute are entitled to hand cut rates, that is, pick miners rate, which they were admittedly getting before 1st August 1961, and, accordingly, these miners will get hand cut rates or pick miners rates from 1st August 1961 till the date of the restoration of their original rates of wages after deducting loaders' wages, if paid after 1st August 1961. If, however, such loaders' rates of wages have not been accepted by these miners, they will get the entire pick miners' rate from 1st August 1961, together with all the privileges and bonus to which they would be entitled as miners. There will be, however, no order for costs.

29. This Award must be implemented within one month from the date this award becomes enforceable under Section 17A of the Act.

30. This is the award which I make and submit to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment, under Section 15 of the Act.

Sd. RAJ KISHORE PRASAD,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal,  
Dhanbad.

Dhanbad, dated the 31st December 1962.

[No. 1/2/62-LRII.]

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 9th January 1963*

**S.O. 181.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Jamadoba Colliery of Messrs. Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, P.O. Jealgora, District Dhanbad, Bihar and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri Gokul Singh, Watchman, by the management of Jamadoba Colliery owned by M/s. Tata Iron & Steel Co. Ltd., P.O. Jealgora (District Dhanbad) was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?'

[No. 2/122/62-LRII.]

*New Delhi, the 14th January 1963*

**S.O. 182.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Srinivasakaruppan Mica Mine, Thoorupundla and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Dr. Mir Siadat Ali Khan, as the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Somajiguda, Hyderabad, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Sarvashri Kanupuru Polalah and Pottella Brahmiah by the Srinivasakaruppan Mica Mine, Thoorupundla was justified and if not, to what relief they are entitled?

[No. 20/20/62-LRII.]

**S.O. 183.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, P.O. Jealgora and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri A. K. Bhattacharjee, Clerk, Grade II, of the office of the Chief Mining Engineer, Jamadoba, P.O. Jealgora by the management of Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., Jamadoba, P.O. Jealgora (District Dhanbad) was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 2/1/63-LRII.]

**S.O. 184.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Khas Godhar Colliery, P.O. Kusunda (Dhabad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the termination of service of Shri Harkhu Rewani, Mechanical Fitter, by the management of Khas Godhar Colliery was legal and proper; if not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 2/117/62-LRIL.]

**S.O. 185.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bhankri Mine of the Government of Rajasthan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the management of the Bhankri Stone Quarry of the Government of Rajasthan were justified in changing the rates of wages and incentive bonus to the Khandwals (quarrymen) engaged at the mine with effect from 5th October 1962 and if not what should be the rates of wages and incentive bonus payable to the Khandwals.

[No. 23/51/62-LRIL.]

**S.O. 186.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Kalithan Jeenagora Colliery of Messrs K. B. Seal and Sons, P.O. Jharla (District Dhanbad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the termination of the services of Shri S. N. Lal, Overman-in-Charge by the management of Kalithan Jeenagora Colliery of Messrs. K. B. Seal and sons, P.O. Jharla (District Dhanbad) was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 2/3/63-LRIL.]

**S.O. 187.**—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between Messrs. Best Mineral (Private Limited), Giripeth, Nagpur, owners of Chargaon Group of Mines at Chargaon, Mansar and Mansar Talao, and their workmen represented by the Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Branch Office, Gujri Chowk, Kamptee, (hereinafter referred to as the Union);

And whereas the said Company and the Union have by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), referred the said dispute to arbitration of the person

named therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement, which was received by the Central Government on the 14th January 1963.

### FORM 'C'

(See Rule 6)

### AGREEMENT

(Under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)

#### BETWEEN

#### NAME OF PARTIES:—

*Representing Employers and their address.*—(1) Shri P. B. Bisen, Agent and General Manager, M/s Best Mineral (Private Ltd.) Giripeth Nagpur owners of Chargaon Group of Mines at Chargaon, Mansar and Mansar Talao.

*Representing workers.*—(2) Shri M. M. Deshkar, Branch Secretary, Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh Branch Office, Gujri Chowk, Kamptee.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer to following Industrial Dispute to the arbitration of Shri S. B. Kale, Deputy, Chief Labour Commissioner (T), New Delhi.

(i) *Specific matters in dispute.*—Whether the dismissal of the workers mentioned below is justified, if not to what relief are they entitled to?

- (1) Sri Prabhakar Narayan (Mansar mine dismissed on 5-10-62.
- (2) Sri Raghunandan Pardesi of Chargaon mine dismissed on 5-10-62.
- (3) Sri Khorbhara Chamru of Mansar mine dismissed on 5-10-62.
- (4) Sri Kallu Pyarelal of Mansar Talao mine dismissed on 13-9-62.
- (5) Sri Jahani Firtu of Mansar Talao mine dismissed on 16-9-62.
- (6) Sri Fattu Kashiram of Mansar Talao mine dismissed on 2-10-62.

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the establishment or undertaking involved.

I. M/s Best Minerals (Private) Ltd., Giripeth, Nagpur Owners of Chargaon Group of Mines at Mansar, members of Mineral Industry Association Nagpur.

II. Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Branch Office, Gujri Chowk, Kamptee. Affiliated to A.I.T.U.C.

(iii) Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question.

Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Branch Office, Gujri Chowk, Kamptee, Affiliated to A.I.T.U.C.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.

50 workers in Mansar and 150 workers in Chargaon mine.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.

Total 6 (six) workers.  
Mansar Talao mine Three.  
Mansar Mine Two.

Chargaon Mine One worker.

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

Witnesses:—

- (1) Sd/-  
4-1-63
- (2) Sd/-

- Sd/- P. B. BISEN,  
(1) Representing employer.
- Sd/- M. M. DESHKAR,  
(2) Representing workers.

Nagpur dated 4th January, 1963

[No. 21/23/62-LRII.]  
A. L. HANDA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 9th January 1963*

**S.O. 188.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 146, dated the 21st February 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Rabindra Nath Banerjee to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of West Bengal for the purposes of the said Act or of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government, or in relation to an establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil-field or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(20)62-PF-I.]

**S.O. 189.**—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 20 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1962, the Central Government makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3416, dated the 3rd November 1962, published in the Gazette of India, dated the 10th November 1962, Part II, Section 3—Sub-section (ii) on page 3710, namely:—

In the said notification, for the words "30th April, 1962 (forenoon)" the words "30th April, 1962 (afternoon)" shall be substituted.

[No. 17(26)/62-PF-I/II.]

**S.O. 190.**—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 20 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. N. Bisarya as Regional Provident Fund Commissioner for the whole of the State of Punjab and the Union territory of Himachal Pradesh *vice* Shri P. N. Bhalla and directs that Shri Bisarya shall work under the general control and superintendence of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner.

[No. 21(8)62-PF-I.]

**S.O. 191.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. N. Bisarya to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Punjab and the Union territory of Himachal Pradesh *vice* Shri P. N. Bhalla for the purposes of the said Act or of any scheme framed thereunder, in relation to an establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to an establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oil-field, or a controlled industry.

[No. 21(8)62-PF-I/II.]

*New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 192.**—Whereas, in the opinion of the Central Government:—

- (1) The rules of the provident fund of M/s. Swadeshi Industries Limited, P.O. Panihati, Distt.—24 Parganas (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment), with respect to the rates of contribution are not less favourable to the employees therein than those specified in section 6 of the Employees' Provident Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952); and
- (2) the employees in the said establishment are also in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits which on the whole are not less favourable to the employees than the benefits provided under the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme) in relation to the employees in any other establishment of a similar character;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government, hereby, exempts the said establishment with effect from the 1st November, 1952, from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme, subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule hereto annexed, which are in addition to the conditions mentioned in the Explanation to sub-section (1) of the said section.

## SCHEDULE

Every establishment shall have a provident fund scheme in force the rules of which with respect to the rates of contribution shall not be less favourable than those specified in section 6 of the Act and the employees shall also be in enjoyment of other provident fund benefits which on the whole shall not be less favourable to the employees than the benefits provided under the Act or any Scheme in relation to the employees in any other establishment of a similar character and these rules shall be followed in all respects.

2. The employer in relation to each establishment (hereinafter referred to as the 'employer' shall within three months of the date of publication of this notification, amend the constitution of the Provident Fund maintained in respect of the establishment in regard to the following matters, namely:—

- (a) the Provident Fund shall vest in a Board of Trustees and there shall be a valid instrument in writing, which adequately safeguards the interests of the employees and such instrument shall be duly registered under section 5 of the Indian Trusts Act, 1882;
- (b) the Board of Trustees shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the employees and the employer, and all questions before the Board shall be decided by a majority of votes;
- (c) the employer shall nominate one of his representatives on the Board as the Chairman who may exercise a casting vote if so provided under the rules of the establishment. Where a casting vote is exercised or where no casting vote is exercised but the opinion of the representatives is equally divided, the matter shall be referred to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner or the State Provident Fund Commissioner appointed under the said Scheme (hereinafter referred to as Regional/State Commissioner) within whose jurisdiction the establishment to which the matter relates is situated and whose decision in the matter shall be final.

3. The Provident Fund Rules of any establishment shall not be amended except with the previous approval of the Regional/State Commissioner. Where any amendment affects the interests of the employees, before giving his approval, the Regional/State Commissioner shall give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

4. (a) The employers shall maintain accounts of the Provident Fund in such manner and submit such returns to the Regional/State Commissioner as the Central Provident Fund Commissioner may, from time to time direct.

(b) The employer shall furnish to the Regional/State Commissioner such accounts relating to the Provident Fund of the establishments as the Central Provident Fund Commissioner may prescribe from time to time. He shall also furnish an annual statement of account or a Pass Book, in such form as may be approved, to each subscriber who, but for the exemption, would have been member of the Fund established under the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952.

(c) The employer shall make all investment of accumulation accruing after the date of exemption in securities of the Central Government. The reinvestment or conversion of securities on maturity shall also be in the securities of the Central Government. The employer shall formulate a procedure for prompt investment of provident fund moneys and shall get it approved from the concerned Regional/State Commissioner.

5. The employer shall afford such facilities for inspection of the accounts of the Provident Fund as the Central Provident Fund Commissioner may from time to time specify.

6. All expenses involved in the administration of the Provident Fund Scheme including the maintenance of accounts, submission of accounts and returns, transfer of accumulations and payment of inspection charges shall be borne by the employer.

7. The employer shall display on the notice board of his establishment in English, a copy of the approved rules and the translation of salient points of the rules in the language of the majority of workers respectively.

8. The employer shall within 3 months of the date of publication of this notification transfer to the Board of Trustees the accumulations standing to the credit of employees who but for the exemption would have been members of the Statutory Fund.

9. When the Fund is wound up or exemption of the establishment is cancelled, accumulations standing to the credit of the employees who, but for the exemption, would have been members of the Statutory Fund shall be transferred to that Fund as soon as possible and, in any case not later than 30 days in the case of securities and not later than 10 days in the case of cash in hand or bank, together with a statement or statements as may be required by the Regional/State Commissioner or Commissioner concerned.

10. The employer shall accept the past provident fund accumulations of an employee who is already a member of the E. P. Fund or an exempted fund and who obtains employment in his establishment. Such an employee shall immediately be admitted as a member of the establishment's Provident Fund. His accumulations which shall be transferred within 3 months of his joining the establishment shall be credited to his account.

11. The employer shall provide for nomination in his provident fund rules in accordance with the provisions contained in paragraph 61 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952.

12. The amount of contributions shall be calculated to the nearest quarter of a rupee; that is, 12.5 naye paise or more shall be counted as the next higher quarter of a rupee and fractions of a rupee less than 12.5 naye paise shall be ignored. The amounts of inspection charges and damages shall be calculated to the nearest 5 naye paise; that is, 2.5 naye paise shall be counted as 5 naye paise and any amount less than 2.5 naye paise shall be ignored.

13. On all repayable loans granted by the establishment interest shall be charged at the rate of  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent per or 1 per cent above the rate allowed on the balance to the credit of the members whichever is higher.

14. The employer shall pay to the Regional/State Commissioner inspection charges payable, falling which damages shall be paid at a rate fixed by the Central Government from time to time.

15. Exemption granted by this notification is liable to be withdrawn by the Central Provident Fund Commissioner for breach of any of the aforesaid conditions or for any other sufficient cause which may be considered appropriate.

16. The Central Government reserve the right to impose such further conditions as may be deemed necessary in the interests of the employees in the establishment.

[No. 11(26)/62-PF.II.]

P. D. GAIHA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 11th January 1963*

**S.O. 193.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following Scheme further to amend the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, the same having been previously published as required by the said sub-section namely:—

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In clause 3 of the Bombay Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme—

(i) after item (a), the following item shall be inserted, namely—

“(aa) ‘Administrative Body’ means the Administrative Body appointed under clause 5 of the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956.”

(ii) In item (c), after the words “Deputy Chairman”, the words “Labour Officer” shall be inserted.

3. For clause of the said Scheme, the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

**"6. Functions of the Deputy Chairman, Labour Officer and the Personnel Officer.**—Without prejudice to the powers and functions of the Board and the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, Labour Officer and the Personnel Officer shall carry out such functions as may be assigned to them by the Chairman under clause 5 or as are provided under this Scheme."

4. In clause 11 of the said Scheme, for sub-clause (6), the following sub-clause shall be substituted namely:—

**"(6) Every listed employer shall pay to the Board administrative and such other charges as may be prescribed by the Board."**

5. After clause 12 of the said Scheme, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—

**"12-A (1) Special provisions in respect of foodgrain workers and their employers.**—The provisions of clauses 8, 9, and 11 to 17 shall, in relation to the foodgrain workers working in the docks and their employers, apply subject to the following provisions, namely:—

- (i) the employer of foodgrain workers appointed by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture shall be listed under sub-clause (3) of clause 8 and his name shall be included in the list of employers; provided that the name of the employer shall be removed from the list of employers on the expiry, termination or cancellation of the employer's contract with the aforesaid Ministry;
- (ii) If the number of foodgrain workers listed under clause 9 is not adequate for the requirement of the docks, the Board may—
  - (a) transfer any of the surplus listed workers, if found suitable, to the list of foodgrain workers; and
  - (b) arrange to list new workers, who are citizens of India, from workers registered with the local Employment Exchange. If, however, the requirement exceeds the number of suitable men available on the register of the Employment Exchange on the day of the recruitment, direct recruitment after absorbing suitable men from the Employment Exchange may be made;
- (iii) the Board shall arrange for the classification of the foodgrain workers by categories in the list and prepare and maintain a separate sub-list of workers for each of the categories. The foodgrain workers listed shall be classified into the following categories, namely:—
  - (a) Baggers;
  - (b) Loaders;
  - (c) (i) Pallawalas;
  - (ii) Pallawallis;
- (d) Stitchers.
- (iv) each sub-list of workers prepared under item (iii) shall constitute a pool of workers for the category to which the said sub-list relates;
- (v) the Baggers and the Loaders shall be employed in gangs, each gang consisting of such number of workers as may be fixed by the Board;
- (vi) workers of each category shall be allotted work by rotation. Where work is carried on by a gang, the allotment of workers by rotation shall be by gangs;
- (vii) the Administrative Body shall be subject to the control and supervision of the Board and the Chairman and shall be responsible for—
  - (a) the allocation of the foodgrain workers in the pools constituted under item (iv) who are available for work, to the employers and for this purpose the Administrative Body shall—
    - (i) be deemed to act as an agent for the employer;
    - (ii) make the fullest possible use of the foodgrain workers in each pool; and
    - (iii) provide for the maintenance of records of employment and earnings;



- (b) the payment, as agent of the employer, to each listed foodgrain worker of all earnings due to him from the employer, and
- (c) authorising the employment of unlisted foodgrain workers if listed workers are not available for work in the pool or in such circumstances as the Board may approve,
- (vii) subject to the provisions of item (vii) (c) a listed employer shall not employ a worker other than a foodgrain worker who has been allocated to him by the Administrative Body in accordance with the provisions of item (vi),
- (ix) the employer shall in accordance with arrangements made by the Administrative Body submit all available information of his current and future labour requirements to that Body,
- (x) the employer shall pay to the Administrative Body in such manner and at such times as the Board may direct, the administrative and such other charges as may be prescribed by the Board payable under sub-clause (6) of clause 11 and the gross wages due to the foodgrain workers,
- (xi) the employer shall keep such records as the Board may require, and shall produce to the Board, or to such persons as may be designated by the Board, upon reasonable notice, all such records and documents of any kind relating to foodgrain workers and to the work upon which they have been employed and furnish such information relating thereto as may be set out in any notice or direction issued by or on behalf of the Board,
- (xii) a foodgrain worker in the pool who is available for work shall be deemed to be in the employment of the Board,
- (xiii) a foodgrain worker in the pool who is available for work shall not engage himself for employment under a listed employer unless he is allocated to that employer by the Administrative Body,
- (xiv) a foodgrain worker in the pool who is available for work shall carry out the directions of the Administrative Body and shall,
  - (a) report at such call stands or control points on such days and at such times as may be specified by the Administrative Body and shall remain at such call stands or control points for such period, not exceeding one hour, as may be specified,
  - (b) accept any employment in connection with dock work, whether in the category or sub-category in which he has been listed or in any other category or sub-category for which he is considered suitable by the Administrative Body,
- (xv) a listed foodgrain worker who is available for work when allocated by the Administrative Body for employment under a listed employer shall carry out his duties in accordance with the directions of such employer or his authorised representative or supervisor and the rules of the port or place where he is working,
- (xvi) a foodgrain worker in the pool who fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Scheme, or commits any act of indiscipline or misconduct, may be reported in writing to the Labour Officer, who may after investigating the matter, give him a warning in writing or suspend him for a period not exceeding seven days,
- (xvii) Where in the opinion of the Labour Officer, a higher punishment than that provided in item (xvi) is merited, he shall report the case to the Deputy Chairman,
- (xviii) on receipt of the written report from the Labour Officer under item (xvi) or from the Administrative Body that a foodgrain worker in the pool has failed to comply with any of the provisions of the Scheme or has committed an act of indiscipline or misconduct or has consistently failed to produce the standard output or has been inefficient in any other manner the Deputy Chairman may make or cause to be made such further investigation as he may deem fit, and thereafter take any of the following steps, as regards the worker

concerned, that is to say, he may impose any of the following penalties:—

- (a) give him a warning in writing;
- (b) suspend him for a period not exceeding 3 months;
- (c) terminate his services after giving 14 days notice; or
- (d) dismiss him;
- (xix) before any action is taken under item (xvi) or (xviii) the person concerned shall be given an opportunity to show cause why the proposed action should not be taken against him. A copy of the final order shall also be communicated to the person concerned;
- (xx) the Administrative Body shall be informed simultaneously about the action taken under item (xvi) or (xviii);
- (xxi) a foodgrain worker in the pool, who is aggrieved by an order passed by the Labour Officer or the Deputy Chairman under item (xvi) or (xviii), as the case may be, may appeal to the next higher authority namely, the Deputy Chairman or the Chairman, as the case may be. The appeal shall be in writing and shall be preferred within 14 days of the receipt of the order appealed against and the order passed on such appeal shall be final;

Provided that the appellate authority may for reasons to be recorded, admit an appeal preferred after the expiry of 14 days.

(2) If the Board is satisfied that the listed foodgrain employer (which shall include the Department of Food or its representative if listed as an employer) has made adequate arrangements for the operation of pool of listed foodgrain workers and payment of wages direct to them, the Board may direct that the provisions of clauses 8, 9 and 11 to 17 of the Scheme shall, in relation to the foodgrain workers and their employers be subject only to the provisions of paragraphs (i) to (vi) of sub-clause (1) and the following—

“If the number of listed foodgrain workers available for work in any shift is not sufficient, the employer may, subject to any limitations imposed by the Board, employ along with the available listed foodgrain workers unlisted workers in that shift”

3. A listed employer shall on demand make a payment to the Administrative Body by way of deposit for wages which may be due to be paid to the listed foodgrain workers against the labour drawn, as the Board may consider necessary.

4. In the Schedule to the said Scheme, after item (2) the following item shall be added, namely:—

“(3) Foodgrain workers working in the docks”.

[530/2/61-Fac.]

*New Delhi, the 14th January 1963*

**S.O. 194.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 14th day of February 1963.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

#### **DRAFT SCHEME**

1. This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, in sub-clause (f) of clause 8, after the words 'conditions of service', the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

"including the age of retirement".

[No. 522/15/62-Fac.]

K. D. HAJELA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th January 1963

**S.O. 195.**—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. 3269 dated the 19th October, 1962 published on pages 3517—3567 in Part II—Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 27th October, 1962. For Annexures B and C substitute the following Annexures, namely:—

#### ANNEXURE B

#### LIST OF CARGO GANGS SUBMITTED BY C.T.T. UNION TO THE COCHIN DOCK LABOUR BOARD

##### Gang No. 1.

D.L.B.  
No.

1. A. T. Charlie	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2165
2. V. L. Achukutty	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1978
3. M. J. Antony	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	1721
4. G. Josy	.	.	.	.	.	"	1906
5. Joseph Niclose	.	.	.	.	.	"	1980
6. Anthechan Charlie	.	.	.	.	.	"	2162
7. P. T. Antony	.	.	.	.	.	"	1887
8. A. M. Rainy	.	.	.	.	.	"	1740
9. P. C. George	.	.	.	.	.	"	1920
10. A. J. John	.	.	.	.	.	"	1888

##### Gang No. 2.

1. K. T. Antony	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2033
2. K. S. Gopalan	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1860
3. P. L. Solomon	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	1731
4. M. A. Vareechan	.	.	.	.	.	"	1849
5. M. M. Vareechan	.	.	.	.	.	"	1897
6. A. P. Jacob	.	.	.	.	.	"	2009
7. C. V. Bastian	.	.	.	.	.	"	1736
8. A. N. Raghavan	.	.	.	.	.	"	1787
9. K. R. Michael	.	.	.	.	.	"	1889
10. A. J. Burleigh	.	.	.	.	.	"	1844

##### Gang No. 3.

1. P. P. Antony	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2019
2. M. S. Achappan	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1732
3. K. L. Joseph	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	1741
4. Augustine Norwy	.	.	.	.	.	"	1993
5. P. V. Kunju Pillai	.	.	.	.	.	"	1805
6. P. A. Sevy	.	.	.	.	.	"	1819
7. C. T. Chacko	.	.	.	.	.	"	1730
8. V. V. Thomas	.	.	.	.	.	"	1925
9. P. J. Benchamin	.	.	.	.	.	"	1800
10. Dumeenk Stanley	.	.	.	.	.	"	1907

*Gang No. 4.*D.L.B.  
No.

1. V. A. John . . . . .	Tindal	104
2. V. L. Lazar . . . . .	Gangwayman	1867
3. K. P. John . . . . .	Batha	1728
4. S. T. Lucos . . . . .	"	1901
5. P. S. Anthappan . . . . .	"	1743
6. P. K. Thomas . . . . .	"	1773
7. K. O. Burleigh . . . . .	"	1725
8. M. R. Surendran . . . . .	"	1770
9. K. A. Chavaro . . . . .	"	1869
10. K. A. Vareechan . . . . .	"	1810

*Gang No. 5.*

1. K. K. Lonappan . . . . .	Tindal	2140
2. P. M. Joseph . . . . .	Gangwayman	1796
3. P. K. Lonan . . . . .	Batha	1854
4. P. X. Peter . . . . .	"	1945
5. P. J. Lawrence . . . . .	"	1984
6. C. X. Joseph . . . . .	"	1794
7. A. J. Cheriyan . . . . .	"	1754
8. C. A. Bernard . . . . .	"	1976
9. C. C. John . . . . .	"	1752
10. E. V. Chacko . . . . .	"	1960

*Gang No. 6.*

1. K. A. Anthappan . . . . .	Tindal	2018
2. P. R. Antho . . . . .	Gangwayman	1910
3. P. K. Vasu . . . . .	Batha	1937
4. N. T. Antony . . . . .	"	1777
5. V. R. Jerome . . . . .	"	1964
6. P. A. Antony . . . . .	"	1864
7. A. O. Philipose . . . . .	"	1801
8. Clarence . . . . .	"	1788
9. P. J. Charlie . . . . .	"	1979
10. T. A. Chacko . . . . .	"	1791

*Gang No. 7.*

1. T. V. Kochappan . . . . .	Tindal	2022
2. A. Moideen . . . . .	Gangwayman	1871
3. T. X. Xavier . . . . .	Batha	1786
4. K. P. Thomas . . . . .	"	1990
5. A. Ali . . . . .	"	1784
6. E. A. Thomas . . . . .	"	1807
7. P. H. Kunjalan . . . . .	"	1789
8. M. P. Philip . . . . .	"	1872
9. V. V. Joseph . . . . .	"	1916
10. P. A. Anthappan . . . . .	"	1929

*Gang No. 8.*

1. K. T. Pathro . . . . .	Tindal	2017
2. P. P. Kutty . . . . .	Gangwayman	1965
3. A. J. Morris . . . . .	Batha	1727
4. P. D. George . . . . .	"	1762
5. T. O. Supri . . . . .	"	1746
6. K. A. Verghese . . . . .	"	1970
7. K. B. Joseph . . . . .	"	1914
8. K. T. Verghese . . . . .	"	1863
9. Kesavan . . . . .	"	1821
10. A. J. Sandhiyavu . . . . .	"	1779

*Gang No. 9.*

1. Thanikkattu Augustine Joseph . . . . .	Tindal	2141
2. N. C. Vincent . . . . .	Gangwayman	1947

D.L.B.  
No.

3. N. T. Joseph . . . . .	Batha	342
4. Alleash Enas . . . . .	"	1995
5. P. V. Sebastian . . . . .	"	1797
6. K. J. Johnkutty . . . . .	"	1983
7. C. P. Francis . . . . .	"	1722
8. P. J. Louis . . . . .	"	1988
9. M. K. Sadasivan . . . . .	"	1911
10. A. A. Josephkutty . . . . .	"	1804

*Gang No. 10.*

1. M. A. Lazar . . . . .	Tindal	2130
2. K. L. Augustine . . . . .	Gangwayman	1757
3. K. F. Raphael . . . . .	Batha	1747
4. K. U. Khalid . . . . .	"	1882
5. P. A. Jacob . . . . .	"	1874
6. Yacko Louiz . . . . .	"	344
7. M. C. Matho . . . . .	"	1894
8. K. E. Pinto . . . . .	"	1873
9. K. V. George . . . . .	"	1852
10. R. Louiz . . . . .	"	1756

*Gang No. 11.*

1. C. P. Sammi . . . . .	Tindal	2144
2. M. P. Thomman . . . . .	Gangwayman	1961
3. P. V. Markose . . . . .	Batha	345
4. K. A. Kaipari . . . . .	"	346
5. K. O. Augustine . . . . .	"	1729
6. N. L. Ousephkutty . . . . .	"	1823
7. V. O. Charlie . . . . .	"	1817
8. C. R. Sebastian . . . . .	"	1977
9. B. V. John . . . . .	"	1939
10. P. K. Sadasivan . . . . .	"	1989

*Gang No. 12.*

1. K. J. Achappan . . . . .	Tindal	2155
2. Hussainar Hamsa . . . . .	Gangwayman	1465
3. Anthechan Peter . . . . .	Batha	1833
4. T. V. Verghese . . . . .	"	352
5. T. A. John . . . . .	"	1832
6. P. M. Antony . . . . .	"	1840
7. V. O. Chori . . . . .	"	1837
8. P. T. John . . . . .	"	1838
9. A. B. Joseph . . . . .	"	1831
10. M. M. George . . . . .	"	1905

*Gang No. 13.*

1. K. B. Pathrose . . . . .	Tindal	42
2. Kozhikedu Muhammed . . . . .	Gangwayman	527
3. T. A. John . . . . .	Batha	1772
4. P. T. Daniel . . . . .	"	1776
5. V. V. Ousephkutty . . . . .	"	1853
6. I. Sreedharan . . . . .	"	1766
7. E. A. Thomas . . . . .	"	1949
8. V. X. Josa . . . . .	"	1846
9. N. T. Antony . . . . .	"	1886
10. K. R. Antony . . . . .	"	1784

*Gang No. 14.*

1. John Chacko . . . . .	Tindal	26
2. M. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	Gangwayman	803
3. P. J. Joseph . . . . .	Batha	1972
4. Robert Fernandez . . . . .	"	1814
5. A.G. Poncho . . . . .	"	1847

D.L.B.  
No.

6. N.L. Antho . . . . .	Batha	1816
7. K.P. Chavaro . . . . .	"	1883
8. P.P. Hassan . . . . .	"	1898
9. P.D. George . . . . .	"	1753
10. T.K. Damodaran . . . . .	"	1767

*Gang No. 15.*

1. C.M. John . . . . .	Tindal	2034
2. Atho Reinel . . . . .	Gangwayman	1793
3. K.S. Vakko . . . . .	Batha	1962
4. K.C. Thomas . . . . .	"	1063
5. K.A. Joseph . . . . .	"	1739
6. Thomas Peter . . . . .	"	1957
7. K.C. Kochappu . . . . .	"	1912
8. C.R. George . . . . .	"	1745
9. P.T. Chacko . . . . .	"	1868
10. K.J. Antony . . . . .	"	1806

*Gang No. 16.*

1. Ouseph Souriyar . . . . .	Tindal	2021
2. C.K. Madhavan . . . . .	Gangwayman	1853
3. Krishnan Gangadharan . . . . .	Batha	1998
4. E.A. Reinold . . . . .	"	1764
5. Gopalan Bhaskaran . . . . .	"	1985
6. P.R. Lonan . . . . .	"	1991
7. Ereeck Sunny . . . . .	"	1913
8. V.V. Chacko . . . . .	"	1878
9. Peersa Sabjhan . . . . .	"	1885
10. K.C. Devassy . . . . .	"	1924

*Gang No. 17.*

1. Vareechan Pathro . . . . .	Tindal	2129
2. K.K. Antony . . . . .	Gangwayman	1954
3. V.T. Achappan . . . . .	Batha	1795
4. P. Verghese . . . . .	"	1781
5. P.D. Albert . . . . .	"	1918
6. V.M. Joseph . . . . .	"	353
7. V.A. Antony . . . . .	"	1071
8. M.O. Chavaro . . . . .	"	363
9. K.O. Sammi . . . . .	"	1734
10. N.J. Antony . . . . .	"	1744

*Gang No. 18.*

1. V.O. Achappan . . . . .	Tindal	2132
2. P.A. Yusuf . . . . .	Gangwayman	1651
3. A.K. Narayanan . . . . .	Batha	2006
4. M.A. Thomman . . . . .	"	1720
5. D.A. Chukutty . . . . .	"	1987
6. C.J. Peter . . . . .	"	1861
7. A.X. Mathew . . . . .	"	1936
8. T.A. Joseph . . . . .	"	1775
9. A.A. Antony . . . . .	"	1994
10. E.A. Cleatus . . . . .	"	1997

*Gang No. 19.*

1. M.O. Chacko . . . . .	Tindal	2156
2. P.P. Francis . . . . .	Gangwayman	1870
3. M.D. Niclo . . . . .	Batha	1857
4. P.X. Mathew . . . . .	"	1893
5. T.D. Ouso . . . . .	"	1735
6. P.O. Thomachan . . . . .	"	1733
7. P.P. Antony . . . . .	"	18
8. A.J. Thomas . . . . .	"	1977
9. P.K. Antony . . . . .	"	1907
10. C.V. Antony . . . . .	"	1877

D.L.B.  
No.

*Gang No. 20.*

1. Kadavunkal Lonan Peter	Tindal	23
2. K.H. Mammali	Gangwayman	1643
3. P.D. Joseph	Batha	1724
4. V.T. Joseph	"	1848
5. C.J. John	"	1862
6. V.V. George	"	1943
7. Silvy George	"	1829
8. K.A. Joseph	"	1737
9. M.A. Antony	"	2002
10. C.A. Pacheecku	"	1835

*Gang No. 21.*

1. Ouseph Pylee	Tindal	
2. Jaini Abdulla	Gangwayman	1491
3. K.S. Thomas	Batha	1940
4. P.R. Antony	"	1792
5. P.A. Josa	"	1808
6. P.L. Joseph	"	1761
7. E.T. Antony	"	1820
8. P.J. Peter	"	1826
9. A.L. Anthappan	"	1836
10. K.J. Peter	"	1845

*Gang No. 22.*

1. Antony Mark	Tindal	215
2. S.M. Mammonji	Gangwayman	52
3. P.G. Philip	Batha	1750
4. T.L. Antony	"	1749
5. M.S. George	"	1950
6. P.X. Pylee	"	1771
7. K.A. Meecku	"	1822
8. K.R. Vareechan	"	1957
9. K.V. Augustine	"	1765
10. A.A. John	"	1933

*Gang No. 23.*

1. P.A. Sainuddin	Tindal	1408
2. Abdulkhadir Moosa	Gangwayman	633
3. P.A. Joseph	Batha	2003
4. N.L. Yohannan	"	1815
5. P.C. Antony	"	1769
6. N.J. Anthappan	"	1934
7. A.K. Beeravu	"	1973
8. V.S. Robert	"	1941
9. C.J. Antony	"	1828
10. Panki Antony	"	1751

*Gang No. 24.*

1. Pethru Ousephachan	Tindal	133
2. K.V. Antony	Gangwayman	167
3. Bernard Joseph	Batha	139
4. Bastian Jacob	"	143
5. A.P. Anthony	"	144
6. Joseph Rayappan	"	147
7. K.V. Thomas	"	151
8. Varudu John	"	156
9. Lonan Devassy	"	160
10. I. Bhaskaran	"	1812

D.L.B.  
No.*Gang No. 25.*

1. Raphael Kaipari . . . . .	Tindal	316
2. S.M. Hamsa . . . . .	Gangwayman	569
3. K.R. Seemon . . . . .	Batha	170
4. N.R. Kumaran . . . . .	"	171
5. C.J. Mathew . . . . .	"	174
6. Jacob Bapputty . . . . .	"	177
7. Augustine Chackachan . . . . .	"	180
8. Niclavosu Ouso . . . . .	"	185
9. Verghese Joseph . . . . .	"	188
10. Raphael Bastian . . . . .	"	246

*Gang No. 26.*

1. A. A. Daruvesh . . . . .	Tindal	806
2. K. Hamsa . . . . .	Gangwayman	572
3. Bast an Peter . . . . .	Batha	324
4. Joseph Antony . . . . .	"	195
5. P. A. Raphael . . . . .	"	197
6. Thresto Varcechan . . . . .	"	199
7. Sammi David . . . . .	"	200
8. Mathayi Easi . . . . .	"	202
9. Bastian Lawrence . . . . .	"	204
10. K. C. Joseph . . . . .	"	216

*Gang No. 27.*

1. Ayyutty Bava . . . . .	Tindal	1561
2. Abdulla Ali . . . . .	Gangwayman	629
3. Ouseph Albert . . . . .	Batha	325
4. M. C. Joseph . . . . .	"	221
5. T. Y. Antony . . . . .	"	234
6. Thomas Raphael . . . . .	"	235
7. Pylee Ereri . . . . .	"	239
8. Kurjappan Ravunny . . . . .	"	247
9. Kunjappan Lakshmanan . . . . .	"	248
10. Chathan Kandan . . . . .	"	1927

*Gang No. 28.*

1. K. M. Abdurahiman . . . . .	Tindal	1125
2. V. K. Syedu . . . . .	Gangwayman	675
3. P. J. Raphael . . . . .	Batha	289
4. Philipose Abel . . . . .	"	292
5. Bastian Xavier . . . . .	"	294
6. P. A. Robert . . . . .	"	295
7. Lonar Abel . . . . .	"	326
8. Chackunry Verghese . . . . .	"	317
9. Gouri Bastian . . . . .	"	318
10. Joseph Athanas . . . . .	"	323

*Gang No. 29.*

1. A. K. Abdulgafoor . . . . .	Tindal	735
2. P. A. Hussain . . . . .	Gangwayman	1327
3. P. G. Joseph . . . . .	Batha	327
4. C. J. Cheecku . . . . .	"	251
5. Janji Jacob . . . . .	"	253
6. A. P. Verghese . . . . .	"	254
7. Manuel Sammi . . . . .	"	255
8. Pathrose Lairese . . . . .	"	257
9. Lavaranth Peter . . . . .	"	261
10. Thomas Reinel . . . . .	"	263



*Gang No. 30.*

D. L. B.  
No.

1. C. B. Hassan	Tindal	1521
2. M. Abdul Razak	Gangwayman	1099
3. A. B. Anthappan	Batha	267
4. K. G. Thomas	"	333
5. George Clement	"	277
6. Joseph George	"	278
7. Sanjohn Abraham	"	282
8. Ouseph Joseph	"	284
9. Joseph Sebastian	"	286
10. Xavier Antony	"	287

*Gang No. 31.*

1. Peter Allesb	Tindal	238
2. Beeran Muhamed	Gangwayman	1080
3. Peter Franklin	Batha	189
4. Bastian Lazar	"	192
5. Kunjuvarudu Kakko	"	193
6. M. B. Joseph	"	196
7. P. B. John	"	262
8. Ouseph Thomas	"	198
9. V. J. Francis	"	203
10. Pethru Joseph	"	217

*Gang No. 32.*

1. Manasseri George	Tindal	3408
2. Makku Avara	Gangwayman	321
3. Niclo Joseph	Batha	212
4. Jacko Lavaru	"	220
5. Joseph Varudu	"	222
6. T. Y. Joseph	"	225
7. K. T. Antho	"	226
8. V. E. Gabriel	"	227
9. A. J. Raphael	"	228
10. T. J. Peter	"	126

*Gang No. 33.*

1. Joseph Sanjohn	Tindal	428
2. Peter Antony	Gangwayman	358
3. A. P. Peter	Batha	183
4. Lonan Vincent	"	201
5. T. J. Anthappan	"	210
6. Augustine Lawrence	"	218
7. Peeli Dumcenku	"	224
8. A. M. Louiz	"	315
9. Joseph Paiva	"	343
10. Yacko Gabriel	"	334

*Gang No. 34.*

1. A. S. Meenkachan	Tindal	283
2. E. G. Mercili	Gangwayman	249
3. K. J. Antony	Batha	161
4. Vachukunju Lawrence	"	135
5. P. D. Gouri	"	330
6. Juse Bastian	"	145
7. Xavier Sanjohn	"	146
8. V. L. Lawrence	"	1760
9. C. J. John	"	154
10. P. P. Antony	"	280

D.L.B.  
No.*Gang No. 35.*

1. C. P. Simon	Tindal	107
2. Ouseph Xavier	Gangwayman	121
3. Augustine Duminic	Batha	288
4. Sammi Marko	"	304
5. P. V. John	"	347
6. A. T. Joseph	"	1799
7. K. A. John	"	271
8. Ouseph Joseph	"	302
9. Joseph Antony	"	127
10. O. P. Thomas	"	168

*Gang No. 36.*

1. Berno Alphonse	Tindal	8
2. Parced Bava	Gangwayman	1183
3. A. T. Bastian	Batha	279
4. C. A. Antony	"	306
5. Joseph Bastian	"	290
6. K. S. Peter	"	310
7. Ousephutty Simon	"	312
8. K. V. Sebastian	"	351
9. Pios Bastian	"	241
10. Joseph Verghese	"	311

*Gang No. 37.*

1. Joseph Enas	Tindal	236
2. K. P. Augustine	Gangwayman	125
3. Anthre Vareechan	Batha	229
4. T. B. Lawrence	"	245
5. Pios Ouso	"	129
6. Joseph Lonan	"	157
7. B. R. Joseph	"	169
8. Sammi Ousephutty	"	190
9. P. J. Jacob	"	205
10. Souriyal Bastian	"	211

*Gang No. 38.*

1. Sammi Vincent	Tindal	338
2. M. Kunheen	Gangwayman	1072
3. Varudu Vakko	Batha	150
4. Thomman Benjamin	"	158
5. Chavaro Lonan	"	215
6. Augustine Peter	"	252
7. Francis John	"	134
8. P. C. Joseph	"	173
9. Sammi Antony	"	322
10. P. P. Antony	"	165

*Gang No. 39.*

1. P. P. Joseph	Tindal	110
2. P. R. Yohannan	Gangwayman	307
3. P. X. Thomas	Batha	118
4. P. P. Samuel	"	120
5. Juse Joseph	"	130
6. K. T. Augustine	"	140
7. M. V. Mathew	"	159
8. K. E. Peter	"	162
9. P. J. Robert	"	272
10. K. V. Rocky	"	339

D.L.B. No.

*Gang No. 40.*

1. E. P. Joseph . . . . .	Tindal	108
2. Senjohn Joseph . . . . .	Bangwayman	138
3. Vareedu Kochacko . . . . .	Batha	137
4. Peter Achappan . . . . .	"	163
5. Lonan Thomas . . . . .	"	172
6. Gouri Joseph . . . . .	"	194
7. K. A. Peter . . . . .	"	237
8. Lonan Joseph . . . . .	"	275
9. A. L. Cleatus . . . . .	"	285
10. Juse Antony . . . . .	"	335

*Gang No. 41.*

1. C. V. Thomas . . . . .	Tindal	109
2. K. B. Verghese . . . . .	Gangwayman	117
3. Francis Rammel . . . . .	Batha	128
4. P. P. Thomas . . . . .	"	136
5. P. V. Kakko . . . . .	"	152
6. Thomas Francis . . . . .	"	179
7. E. A. Devassy . . . . .	"	265
8. Francis Joseph . . . . .	"	293
9. M. M. Thomas . . . . .	"	230
10. Thomas George . . . . .	"	164

*Gang No. 42.*

1. A. U. Kunjurnohammed . . . . .	Tindal	1615
2. P. K. Narayanan . . . . .	Gangwayman	1530
3. Hassan . . . . .	Batha	1424
4. Ismail . . . . .	"	1489
5. M. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1531
6. Kasinkutty . . . . .	"	1533
7. C. M. Mammu . . . . .	"	1557
8. K. B. Syedu . . . . .	"	1558
9. B. Ibrahim . . . . .	"	1636
10. M. Kassin . . . . .	"	1607

*Gang No. 43.*

1. M. Sulaiman . . . . .	Tindal	1421
2. A. Kassi . . . . .	Gangwayman	1520
3. Kunjammu . . . . .	Batha	1621
4. Kunjammu Azecz . . . . .	"	1453
5. A. K. Bava . . . . .	"	1438
6. M. K. Raman . . . . .	"	1433
7. Moideen . . . . .	"	1464
8. Mammu Syedalavi . . . . .	"	1467
9. Moidu Muhamed . . . . .	"	1472
10. Pareed . . . . .	"	1556

*Gang No. 44.*

1. P. K. Abdu . . . . .	Tindal	1546
2. P. A. Hamsa . . . . .	Gangwayman	1656
3. Kunju Moidcen . . . . .	Batha	1567
4. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1620
5. K. B. Ebrahim . . . . .	"	1661
6. C. M. Ismail . . . . .	"	579
7. K. Koyakunhu . . . . .	"	1164
8. K. K. Mamma . . . . .	"	1170
9. M. K. Mustafa . . . . .	"	598
10. M. Kasin . . . . .	"	705

*Gang No. 45.*

1. V. A. Hamsa . . . . .	Tindal	1642
2. Kunheen . . . . .	Gangwayman	1452
3. Muhammed . . . . .	Batha	1431
4. Ebrahim . . . . .	"	1474

D.L.B. No.

5. Beeran Muhamed . . . . .	Batha	1504
6. Amman . . . . .	"	1508
7. A Sulaiman . . . . .	"	1603
8. Kunhadima . . . . .	"	1526
9. C. K. Khalid . . . . .	"	1637
10. P. K. Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	1641

*Gang No. 46.*

1. K. B. Ali . . . . .	Tindal	1519
2. Mammusan . . . . .	Gangwayman	1462
3. C. M. Pareekutty . . . . .	Batha	1541
4. Abubakar Syedu . . . . .	"	1461
5. Adima Moideen . . . . .	"	1476
6. Pareekutty . . . . .	"	1495
7. Moideenkutty . . . . .	"	1525
8. C. K. Hameed . . . . .	"	1617
9. Abdulla Ali . . . . .	"	1073
10. Mohamed . . . . .	"	1644

*Gang No. 47.*

1. P. K. Khalid . . . . .	Tindal	1420
2. Abdulkhadir Muhamed . . . . .	Gangwayman	1382
3. E. A. Alikunhu . . . . .	Batha	1422
4. Moideenkutty Moosa . . . . .	"	1459
5. Muhamed Ummer . . . . .	"	1492
6. P. Bavakutty . . . . .	"	1505
7. M. Muhamed . . . . .	"	1518
8. H. Ibrahim . . . . .	"	1081
9. Adam Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	1083
10. C. H. Bava . . . . .	"	1625

*Gang No. 48.*

1. P. K. Alibava . . . . .	Tindal	1622
2. M. K. Bbrahim . . . . .	Gangwayman	544
3. Krishnan Appu . . . . .	Batha	1222
4. Mammu Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1439
5. Muhamedali . . . . .	"	1446
6. K. M. Bapputty . . . . .	"	1481
7. Yusuf . . . . .	"	1542
8. Syedu Muhamed . . . . .	"	1544
9. K. M. Kunhumammed . . . . .	"	1578
10. Munhumon . . . . .	"	1627

*Gang No. 49.*

1. Kunhumarakkar Adima . . . . .	Tindal	1475
2. Mamu Moideen . . . . .	Gangwayman	1444
3. Moidu Muhamed . . . . .	Batha	1432
4. Abdulkhadir Pareed . . . . .	"	1241
5. P. M. Kassim . . . . .	"	1410
6. M. Moideen . . . . .	"	1608
7. Abu . . . . .	"	1657
8. Ayamulla Hamsa . . . . .	"	1111
9. Muhamed Abdulla . . . . .	"	1116
10. Joseph Verghese . . . . .	"	1340

*Gang No. 50.*

1. P. K. Beerankutty . . . . .	Tindal	1447
2. P. K. Komu . . . . .	Gangwayman	1648
3. P. K. Muhamedali . . . . .	Batha	1522
4. P. K. Hamsa . . . . .	"	1440
5. K. M. Alibava . . . . .	"	1574
6. Sulaiman . . . . .	"	1585
7. Abdulrahiman . . . . .	"	1613
8. V. A. Abubakar . . . . .	"	1654
9. A. Moideen . . . . .	"	1084
10. P. A. Hamsa . . . . .	"	1477

*Gang No. 51*

D L B. No.

1. V. A Hassan	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1599
2. Muhammed Hassan	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1118
3. Bava	.	.	.	.	"	1560
4. Ummer	.	.	.	.	"	2063
5. M. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	"	1573
6. Muhamed Abu	.	.	.	.	"	1448
7. K. I. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	"	1414
8. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	"	1626
9. Kunhumohamed Ebrahim	.	.	.	.	"	1120
10. Abdurahiman Muhamed	.	.	.	.	"	1395

*Gang No. 52*

1. M. J. Abubakar	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1559
2. Abdurahiman Bava	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1291
3. Seydu	.	.	.	.	Batha	1547
4. Hamsa Koya	.	.	.	.	"	1490
5. Muhamed Adima	.	.	.	.	"	1429
6. K. P. Parackutty	.	.	.	.	"	1509
7. M. Beerasa	.	.	.	.	"	1539
8. T. M. Munhumohamed	.	.	.	.	"	1484
9. Abdulkhani	.	.	.	.	"	1157
10. Muhamed Abdulkhadir	.	.	.	.	"	1138

*Gang No. 53*

1. Abdurahiman Muhamed	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1511
2. P.M. Abdullah	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	737
3. Mammu Bava	.	.	.	.	Batha	1981
4. C K. Kunjumohamed	.	.	.	.	"	740
5. K. Sulaiman	.	.	.	.	"	739
6. K. Khadir	.	.	.	.	"	743
7. Moideen	.	.	.	.	"	770
8. K A Bava	.	.	.	.	"	807
9. Sinuddin	.	.	.	.	"	738
10. Abu	.	.	.	.	"	775

*Gang No 54*

1. K B Moideen	.	.	.	.	Tindal	838
2. P.K. Kunhumohamed	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	811
3. B A Muhamed	.	.	.	.	Batha	742
4. P K Abdu	.	.	.	.	"	826
5. P A Cristo	.	.	.	.	"	1161
6. Verghese Ouseph	.	.	.	.	"	1162
7. M B Ummer	.	.	.	.	"	781
8. K.K Mammu	.	.	.	.	"	791
9. Velayudhan	.	.	.	.	"	1755
10. P A Sulaiman	.	.	.	.	"	798

*Gang No 55*

1. B Hassan	.	.	.	.	Tindal	77
2. B Abdurazak	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	833
3. V M Aikutty	.	.	.	.	Batha	808
4. K K Abdulkhadir	.	.	.	.	"	795
5. A Aliyar	.	.	.	.	"	789
6. K M Hassan	.	.	.	.	"	771
7. Ismail	.	.	.	.	"	746
8. P.A. Ummer	.	.	.	.	"	750
9. P S. Sankara Pillai	.	.	.	.	"	766
10. K E Hussain	.	.	.	.	"	778

*Gang No. 56*

D.L.B. No.

1.	M. Moideenkutty	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1479
2.	Moosa Abubakar	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	834
3.	O.A. Abdulla	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	774
4.	Daniel Kakko	.	.	.	.	.	"	805
5.	K.M. Kumhumohamed	.	.	.	.	.	"	824
6.	M.B. Pareekutty	.	.	.	.	.	"	792
7.	P.K. Narayanan	.	.	.	.	.	"	1782
8.	Moosa Mammu	.	.	.	.	.	"	741
9.	Muna Muhamed	.	.	.	.	.	"	753
10.	Bava Ebrahim	.	.	.	.	.	"	815

*Gang No. 57*

1.	T.A. Abdurahiman	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	447
2.	K.B. Mammu	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	767
3.	P.K. Kunhumon	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	769
4.	M.K. Hydrose	.	.	.	.	.	"	821
5.	K. Krishnan Nair	.	.	.	.	.	"	793
6.	Bava Kocho	.	.	.	.	.	"	817
7.	A.B. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	.	"	761
8.	V.M. Ebrahim	.	.	.	.	.	"	804
9.	K.A. Ali	.	.	.	.	.	"	786
10.	K.V. Chavaro	.	.	.	.	.	"	1798

*Gang No. 58*

1.	K.K. Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	443
2.	N.A. Kunhumarakkaru	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	758
3.	P.S. Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	827
4.	P.A. Mamma	.	.	.	.	.	"	825
5.	C.K. Bavakutty	.	.	.	.	.	"	744
6.	Abdulla	.	.	.	.	.	"	788
7.	Ismail	.	.	.	.	.	"	794
8.	K.B. Thomas	.	.	.	.	.	"	1809
9.	P.K. Ummer	.	.	.	.	.	"	832
10.	Ismail	.	.	.	.	.	"	796

*Gang No. 59*

1.	C.M. Khalid	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	439
2.	K.A. Bava	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	606
3.	Ebrahim Abu	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	561
4.	Moideenkutty Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	"	556
5.	M.A. Hameed	.	.	.	.	.	"	593
6.	K.A. Sheriff	.	.	.	.	.	"	610
7.	K.K. Kuttappan	.	.	.	.	.	"	1824
8.	P.B. Abdulla	.	.	.	.	.	"	562
9.	C.M. Syedu	.	.	.	.	.	"	608
10.	N.A. Hassan	.	.	.	.	.	"	591

*Gang No. 60*

1.	K.K. Abdullakutty	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	446
2.	A.K. Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	547
3.	T.K. Syedu	.	.	.	.	.	Batha	521
4.	Pareekutty Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	"	522
5.	Beerankutty Hamsa	.	.	.	.	.	"	513
6.	Kunhumarakkar Khadir	.	.	.	.	.	"	618
7.	Mercili K.I.	.	.	.	.	.	"	1850
8.	K.A. Hassan	.	.	.	.	.	"	580
9.	Kalur Kayi	.	.	.	.	.	"	612
10.	K.A. Moidu	.	.	.	.	.	"	581

## Gang No. 61

		D.I.B. No.
1.	P.B. Hamsa . . . . .	Tindal 437
2.	Abdurahman Khadir . . . . .	Gangwayman 578
3.	P.M. Syedu . . . . .	Batha 492
4.	Bava Moideenkutty . . . . .	" 502
5.	Muhamed Koya . . . . .	" 517
6.	V.K. Pushkaran . . . . .	" 1876
7.	Abdrahman Bava . . . . .	" 533
8.	George Ouso . . . . .	" 532
9.	E.M. Ebrahim . . . . .	" 523
10.	Makkar Muhamed . . . . .	" 571

## Gang No. 62

1.	Hassan Muhamed . . . . .	Tindal 435
2.	Arakkal Umbai . . . . .	Gangwayman 490
3.	V.A. Abdullakutty . . . . .	Batha 510
4.	Hydrose Kunhumamed . . . . .	" 508
7.	P.M. Abu . . . . .	" 512
6.	O. Bava . . . . .	" 515
7.	Kochumodeen Muhamed . . . . .	" 496
8.	E.B. Hamsa . . . . .	" 495
9.	Arakkal Moideen . . . . .	" 499
10.	Ismail Abdulkhadir . . . . .	" 498

## Gang No. 63

1.	K.K. Mamma . . . . .	Tindal 444
2.	P.P. Abdulkader . . . . .	Gangwayman 528
3.	Moideenkutty Ummer . . . . .	Batha 509
4.	T.H. Ummer . . . . .	" 507
5.	Hassainar Ummerkoya . . . . .	" 554
6.	P.K. Hydrose . . . . .	" 559
7.	Varudukutty Manuel . . . . .	" 1286
8.	Bava Muhamed . . . . .	" 493
9.	K.A. Hamsa . . . . .	" 601
10.	C.A. Hamsa . . . . .	" 609

## Gang No. 64

1.	K.A. Mamma . . . . .	Tindal 3404
2.	V.A. Ali . . . . .	Gangwayman 558
3.	Souro Varudunny . . . . .	Batha 604
4.	Becrankutty Bava . . . . .	" 590
5.	M.S. Majeed . . . . .	" 530
6.	V.M. Azceez . . . . .	" 553
7.	N.A. Muhamedkutty . . . . .	" 511
8.	K. Vasu . . . . .	" 764
9.	K.M. Khalid . . . . .	" 589
10.	Kunjali Umbai . . . . .	" 573

## Gang No. 65

1.	T.M. Usman . . . . .	Tindal 71
2.	A.M. Bava . . . . .	Gangwayman 472
3.	Ebrahim Kunhumon . . . . .	Batha 473
4.	K.H. Abu . . . . .	" 487
5.	Kochuveettil Kunhumamed . . . . .	" 494
6.	P.C. Abu . . . . .	" 763
7.	K. Muhamed . . . . .	" 574
8.	A.K. Kunheen Pulla . . . . .	" 1293
9.	K. Muhamed . . . . .	" 1904
10.	P.M. Moideenkutty . . . . .	" 587

## Gang No. 66

D.I.B. No.

1. Kalvatty Kunjoosa . . . . .	Tindal	436
2. Aymulla Syedu . . . . .	Gangwayman	621
3. P. T. Joseph . . . . .	Batha	1915
4. Ouseph Enas . . . . .	"	1899
5. T. G. Sreedharan . . . . .	"	1930
6. N. A. Synuddin . . . . .	"	631
7. P. M. Kunhumon . . . . .	"	639
8. Moideenkutty Kunjali . . . . .	"	644
9. Arakkal Mammu . . . . .	"	497
10. K. E. Kunhumohamed . . . . .	"	628

## Gang No. 67

1. Mullakkattu Bapputty . . . . .	Tindal	3407
2. Adima Abdulla . . . . .	Gangwayman	603
3. C. K. Abubakar . . . . .	Batha	643
4. P. A. Ahamed . . . . .	"	471
5. Aliahamed Moosa . . . . .	"	486
6. Syedali Ayamu . . . . .	"	545
7. Kunhumon Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	549
8. M. M. Muhamed . . . . .	"	582
9. Ahamed Syedmohamed . . . . .	"	607
10. K. B. Muhamed . . . . .	"	634

## Gang No. 68

1. P. M. Syedu . . . . .	Tindal	1060
2. Hassainar Pareekutty . . . . .	Gangwayman	1543
3. K. M. Usman . . . . .	Batha	479
4. Kassin Bava . . . . .	"	477
5. C. V. Tomy . . . . .	"	565
6. T. A. Muhamedkutty . . . . .	"	525
7. P. K. Abdulla . . . . .	"	566
8. P. K. Abdurahimankutty . . . . .	"	617
9. Moldu Muhamed . . . . .	"	641
10. K. K. Hassan . . . . .	"	474

## Gang No. 69

1. C. Muhamed . . . . .	Tindal	449
2. Ayamutty Ebrahim . . . . .	Gangwayman	520
3. K. M. Ali . . . . .	Batha	483
4. M. Ahamedkunhu . . . . .	"	516
5. Kunjava Kunjali . . . . .	"	519
6. M. Muhamedali . . . . .	"	540
7. Amad Moideenkutty . . . . .	"	541
8. K. K. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	543
9. Hassan Ammukunhu . . . . .	"	548
10. C. H. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	552

## Gang No. 70

1. K. P. Kochunny . . . . .	Tindal	40
2. Hameed Ali . . . . .	Gangwayman	625
3. B. Muhamed . . . . .	Batha	619
4. Khadir Syedava . . . . .	"	1295
5. Paval Peter . . . . .	"	1299
6. Kochunny Mammusan . . . . .	"	1304
7. Xavier Jovayi . . . . .	"	1306
8. T. U. Khalid . . . . .	"	642
9. Varkey Poullose . . . . .	"	1180
10. Matho George . . . . .	"	1184



*Gang No. 71*

D.I.B. No.

1. N. K. Abdulrahiman	Tindal	995
2. P. M. Pareed	Gangwayman	504
3. Amad Ali	Batha	534
4. K. A. Abdulrahiman	"	482
5. Augustine Antony	"	1186
6. Kakko Antony	"	1187
7. Muhamed Abubakar	"	1367
8. K. Ibrahim	"	576
9. Ahamed Hassan	"	1188
10. Alavi Bava	"	500

*Gang No. 72*

1. T. M. Bava	Tindal	3406
2. K. A. Abu	Gangwayman	752
3. M. B. Hamsa	Batha	514
4. Anthony Silvi	"	1274
5. A. R. John	"	2007
6. Beeran Bava	"	1276
7. Ummer Abdu	"	560
8. Devassy Verghese	"	564
9. Calvetty Umbai	"	567
10. Khadir Moideen	"	570

*Gang No. 73*

1. U. K. Bavu	Tindal	1246
2. P. A. Yahu	Gangwayman	1659
3. P. A. Muhamed	Batha	756
4. S. Muhamed	"	1169
5. Francis Sunny	"	1279
6. C. M. Abdu	"	1172
7. Chacko Raphael	"	1176
8. Theetho Josa	"	1283
9. Moideen Kunjali	"	1178
10. Xavier Anthony	"	1257

*Gang No. 74*

1. Pookunhi Koya	Tindal	1062
2. R. M. Kunheenkutty	Gangwayman	749
3. Ammutty Ebrahim	Batha	1342
4. Chiyamu M. Ideenkutty	"	1064
5. A. A. George	"	1935
6. A. P. Varudu	"	1345
7. Devassy Raphael	"	1359
8. Abdulla Kunhumohamed	"	1354
9. C. V. Peru	"	1356
10. Ali Moidunny	"	1358

*Gang No. 75*

1. Kunjava Kunjami	Tindal	1078
2. P. A. Alikutty	Gangwayman	1074
3. Ahamed Adumakunhi	Batha	1370
4. Beerankutty Hameed	"	1372
5. Koya Muhamedali	"	1124
6. Kunhikhadir Kunjumohamed	"	1137
7. Ouseph Pappu	"	1378
8. Kunjumarakkur Abu	"	1139
9. Beeravunny Hamsa	"	1065
10. Beeran Bava	"	1380

## Gang No. 76

D I.B. No.

1. K. M. Abu . . . . .	Tindal	1614
2. P. A. Moideenkutty . . . . .	Gangwayman	1068
3. P. M. Antony . . . . .	Batha	1948
4. K. A. Francis . . . . .	"	1960
5. Pylo John . . . . .	"	1214
6. Ahamed Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	1217
7. Beerankutty Ayamu . . . . .	"	1219
8. Ahamedkutty Hamsa . . . . .	"	1220
9. Sebastian Dumini . . . . .	"	1224
10. Vincent George . . . . .	"	1225

## Gang No. 77

1. Bastian Gonsalvis . . . . .	Tindal	1408
2. A. K. Kunhiyamu . . . . .	Gangwayman	1270
3. Moidu Bava . . . . .	Batha	1381
4. Pareed Becravu . . . . .	"	1239
5. Moideen Abdulla . . . . .	"	1228
6. Peter Francis . . . . .	"	1240
7. Adam Abdulla . . . . .	"	1232
8. Hydru Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1233
9. Muhmed Hassan . . . . .	"	1234
10. Khadir Yusuf . . . . .	"	1235

## Gang No. 78

1. M. Bapputty . . . . .	Tindal	1066
2. P. A. Bava . . . . .	Gangwayman	1284
3. Moideen Bava . . . . .	Batha	1246
4. Adbullakhan Babjhan . . . . .	"	1092
5. P. M. Kocho . . . . .	"	1093
6. Kunjammatty Abubakar . . . . .	"	1094
7. Ibrahim Ummer . . . . .	"	1540
8. Muhamed Bapputty . . . . .	"	1096
9. M. A. Ummer . . . . .	"	1061
10. Alibava . . . . .	"	1247

## Gang No. 79

1. V. A. Syedali . . . . .	Tindal	1097
2. Muhamed Sulaiman . . . . .	Gangwayman	1103
3. Thomas Vincent . . . . .	Batha	1193
4. Achutan Nanu . . . . .	"	1194
5. Beeran Hamsa . . . . .	"	1197
6. Muhamed Hussan . . . . .	"	1200
7. Ebrahim Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	1202
8. Abdurahiman Moidunny . . . . .	"	1204
9. Muhamed Bava . . . . .	"	1206
10. Ali Moideenkutty . . . . .	"	1207

## Gang No. 80

1. A. P. Mamoonhi . . . . .	Tindal	20
2. M. K. Abdurahimankutty . . . . .	Gangwayman	1067
3. C. A. Mammu . . . . .	Batha	1419
4. Kutty Gangadharan . . . . .	"	1249
5. Chandu Francis . . . . .	"	1250
6. Lazar Pylec . . . . .	"	1335
7. Kuttappan Kunhan . . . . .	"	1337
8. Mohamed Abu . . . . .	"	1338
9. Thomas Sebastian . . . . .	"	1339
10. Ahamed Kunjava . . . . .	"	1153

Gang No. 81.

D.L.B. No.

1. Pocker Alavi . . . . .	Tindal	1349
2. N. V. Muhamed . . . . .	Gangwayman	1101
3. Bukhari Kunhumamed . . . . .	Batha	1260
4. C. A. Khalid . . . . .	"	1261
5. U. K. Abdu . . . . .	"	1262
6. Hydru Mayin . . . . .	"	1263
7. Beeran Syedu . . . . .	"	1267
8. Becravu Abdurahiman . . . . .	"	1063
9. O. M. Peter . . . . .	"	823
10. P. M. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1273

Gang No. 82.

1. A. Muhamedbava . . . . .	Tindal	105
2. Imbichi Abdraman . . . . .	Gangwayman	1458
3. Muhamedali Baddruddin . . . . .	Batha	1268
4. Kochumoidu Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	1311
5. R. K. Muhamed . . . . .	"	
6. Paul Joseph . . . . .	"	1317
7. Vareed Thomas . . . . .	"	1319
8. Lonappan Simon . . . . .	"	1321
9. Earnest Korraya . . . . .	"	1323
10. Marakkar Moideen . . . . .	"	1330

Gang No. 83.

1. K. Abdurahiman . . . . .	Tindal	76
2. Kader Mammoonhi . . . . .	Gangwayman	1312
3. T. V. Thankappan . . . . .	Batha	1763
4. K. P. Abu . . . . .	"	1891
5. E. J. John . . . . .	"	242
6. P. O. Ouseph . . . . .	"	1456
7. Mathew M. . . . .	"	1563
8. P. A. Achappan . . . . .	"	155
9. George John . . . . .	"	182
10. M. B. Muhamed . . . . .	"	1256

Gang No. 84.

1. Mustafa Koya . . . . .	Tindal	996
2. Moidu Alikutty . . . . .	Gangwayman	1252
3. K. S. Vareechan . . . . .	Batha	332
4. P. A. Hamsa . . . . .	"	531
5. Abdulla Muhamed . . . . .	"	568
6. Vareechan . . . . .	"	1723
7. Paul Lavaranthu . . . . .	"	1251
8. Moidunny Muhamed . . . . .	"	1644
9. Mohamedkutty Syedali . . . . .	"	1253
10. M. Mohamed . . . . .	"	818

Gang No. 85.

1. A. Abdu . . . . .	Tindal	1423
2. Imbichi Ebrahim . . . . .	Gangwayman	1455
3. A. A. Madhavan . . . . .	Batha	2011
4. Sheik Muhamed . . . . .	"	2046
5. M. D. Antho . . . . .	"	2060
6. T. E. Joseph . . . . .	"	2163
7. Simon Joseph . . . . .	"	166
8. P. B. Ahamu . . . . .	"	772
9. K. K. Pareed . . . . .	"	776
10. Abdu . . . . .	"	812

Sd. M. K. Raghavan, 4-11-62

Sd. W. H. D'Cruz.

Sd. B. K. Jayaram Rao, 4-11-62.

## ANNEXURE B (contd.)

## LIST OF CARGO WINCHMEN SUBMITTED BY C.T.T.U. TO THE COCHIN DOCK LABOUR BOARD

Sl. No.	Name	D.L.B. No.	Category
1	Samuel Jorus . . . . .	224	Winchman
2	Dumink Bastian . . . . .	260	"
3	Braveli Albert . . . . .	1416	"
4	K. P. Lazar . . . . .	2133	"
5	N. T. Souriyal . . . . .	2134	"
6	Verghese Netto . . . . .	2136	"
7	Augustine Lazar . . . . .	2137	"
8	P. A. Antony . . . . .	2138	"
9	K. A. Pappachan . . . . .	2139	"
10	E. A. Ousephkutty . . . . .	74	"
11	O. S. Thiyo . . . . .	75	"
12	P. M. Kunjammatty . . . . .	78	"
13	Muhammunny . . . . .	79	"
14	C. R. Abraham . . . . .	80	"
15	Ismail . . . . .	83	"
16	Kochunny . . . . .	1633	"
17	Hamsa . . . . .	1535	"
18	Khalid . . . . .	1601	"
19	M. A. Majeed . . . . .	762	"
20	P. Sulaiman . . . . .	994	"
21	P. F. Peter . . . . .	114	"
22	Augustine Thomas . . . . .	308	"
23	Augustine Berno . . . . .	314	"
24	Ousephytty Peter . . . . .	341	"
25	P. P. Antony . . . . .	357	"
26	P. A. Anuclai . . . . .	2158	"
27	V. J. Reinel . . . . .	2159	"
28	K. A. Joseph . . . . .	2161	"
29	Kunjumoiden Mammi . . . . .	469	"
30	T. H. Hamsa . . . . .	470	"
31	P. X. Joseph . . . . .	119	"
32	E. A. Gouri . . . . .	281	"
33	N. T. Bavachan . . . . .	2147	"
34	N. V. Joseph . . . . .	2148	"
35	A. M. Peter . . . . .	1249	"
36	T. J. John . . . . .	2151	"
37	Souriyal Devassy . . . . .	2152	"
38	Pulikkal Raphael Albert . . . . .	22	"
39	Kadaviparambil Thomas George . . . . .	24	"
40	Alakamserry Sankunny Damodaran . . . . .	25	"
41	Kakkasserry Thomman Joseph . . . . .	29	"
42	Palakkaparampil Veeran Abdurahiman . . . . .	30	"
43	Karaveli Pressy Anthappan . . . . .	31	"
44	Kalathail Muhamed Abdullakutty . . . . .	36	"
45	Arakkal Gouri Vareechan . . . . .	39	"
46	Puthenpurakkal Bappu Jacob . . . . .	41	"
47	C. M. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	3410	"
48	Kannan Ayyappan . . . . .	3415	"
49	Ponnani Unmer . . . . .	3416	"
50	Maliakkal Peter . . . . .	3417	"
51	P. S. Kunjumohamed . . . . .	993	"
52	A. P. Mammali . . . . .	462	"
53	P. M. Moideen . . . . .	464	"
54	M. K. Vincent . . . . .	141	"
55	V. A. Sulaiman . . . . .	1425	"
56	T. J. Andrew . . . . .	111	"
57	Berno Joseph . . . . .	113	"
58	V. V. Joseph . . . . .	116	"

1	2	3	4
59	George Thomas	131	Winchman
60	Kaiparai Stephen	132	"
61	Pether George	142	"
62	Thomas Antony	176	"
63	P. R. Easi	232	"
64	Bastian Sammi	264	"
65	Joseph Jacob	268	"
66	Bastian Peter	269	"
67	George John	301	"
68	C. J. Abraham	354	"
69	K. A. Xavier	355	"
70	Adima Hamsa	448	"
71	R. M. Khadir	450	"
72	C. T. Muhamed	452	"
73	Ismail Bava	453	"
74	M. B. Bavakunji	455	"
75	V. M. Hassan	457	"
76	Ali Adamkutty	458	"
77	T. K. Muhamed	459	"
78	A. A. Muhamed	461	"
79	Kunnumpuram Bava Ali	463	"
80	A. K. Abdurahiman	466	"
81	E. M. Muhamed	468	"
82	Abdulkhadir	990	"
83	Abdulrahiman	991	"
84	K. Alavi	1082	"
85	Kunjamu Yusuf	1106	"
86	Ahamu Kunhumohamed	1117	"
87	P. K. Abubakar	1292	"
88	Bava Muhamed P. B.	1357	"
89	K. B. Abdulla	1376	"
90	C. K. Muhamed	1426	"
91	Adam Khadir	1436	"
92	Kunhumohamed Mamma	1443	"
93	M. K. Sulaman	1445	"
94	Hydroze Kunheenkutty	1468	"
95	K. Ahyar	1501	"
96	K. K. Makkar	1572	"
97	P. M. Pareekutty	1586	"
98	Ahamed Abdu	1589	"
99	Mammi Ali	1597	"
100	Syed Muhamed Ebrahim	1618	"
101	K. A. Hamsa	1649	"
102	K. P. Reyani	1759	"
103	K.T. John	1971	"
104	A.P. Joseph	2026	"
105	K.A. Sandhuyavu	2027	"
106	P.T. Bastian	2028	"
107	M.R. Acho	2029	"
108	P.P. Pecho	2030	"
109	Rammel	2031	"
110	K. J. Antony	2032	"
111	P.R. George	2035	"
112	L.V. Achampi	2036	"
113	Abdulkhadir	990	"
114	Hussan Ebrahim	2037	"
115	N.C. Xavier	2039	"
116	P.R. Solomon	2040	"
117	A.S. Gouri	2041	"
118	Almuhamed Moideenkutty	988	"
119	Adima Beeran	456	"
120	Alikutty Syedu	1069	"
121	P.M. Kunjali	73	"

ANNEXURE B.—*contd.*LIST OF COAL AND BULK IN GANGS SUBMITTED BY C.T.T.U. TO  
THE COCHIN DOCK LABOUR BOARD*Gang No. 1**D.L.B. No.*

1. Thykoodan Chacko	Tindal	115
2. Ouseph Josa	Winchman	383
3. Ouseph Pylee	"	860
4. K.K. Madhavan	Gangwayman	395
5. Devassy Antony	Batha (C)	379
6. Ouseph Ouso	"	380
7. Paul Ouso	"	381
8. Lazar Joseph	"	384
9. Joseph George	"	385
10. Chavaro Peter	"	386
11. Kakko Raphael	"	387
12. Kumaran	"	2295
13. Lonan Peter	"	389
14. Bava Chavaro	"	390
15. Varudu Joseph	"	393
16. Varudu Pappachan	"	394

*Gang No. 2*

1. C. Sebastian	Tindal	852
2. L.A. Joseph	Winchman	898
3. Thomas George	"	1334
4. Bava Cheecku	Gangwayman	2228
5. K.T. Joseph	Batha (C)	399
6. Thomas Ouseph	"	400
7. Ouseph Marko	"	401
8. Varudu Xavier	"	403
9. Sourri Maneek	"	404
10. Ouseph Varudu	"	407
11. K.C. Antony	"	409
12. T.O. Verghese	"	411
13. A.B. Antony	"	415
14. P.C. Louiz	"	417
15. C.B. Augustine	"	421
16. K.O. Xavier	"	422

*Gang No. 3*

1. P.A. Hassan	Tindal	888
2. P.T. Verghese	Winchman	868
3. C.N. Raman	"	850
4. K.C. Anthappan	Gangwayman	891
5. Xavier Joseph	Batha (C)	424
6. Xavier Verghese	"	425
7. P.T. Xavier	"	426
8. Beervunny Ebrahim	"	679
9. Mammoonhi Abu	"	682
10. T.K. Syedalavi	"	684
11. Adima Hydrose	"	687
12. Ayamu Hamsa	"	688
13. K.B. Muhamed	"	691
14. P.K. Kunhumamed	"	692
15. P.S. Abdulkhadr	"	698
16. Picha Ebrahim	"	700

*Gang No. 4*

1. P.A. Hashin	Tindal	699
2. P.O. Lonan	Winchman	1015
3. Kutty Sreedharan	"	836
4. V.V. Antony	Gangwayman	1038
5. Hassan Ummer	Batha (C)	701
6. C.P. Ayyappan	"	702

*D.B.L. No.*

7. Chathan . . . . .	Batha (C)	837
8. Thevan . . . . .	"	845
9. Xavier . . . . .	"	847
10. Padmanabhan . . . . .	"	854
11. T. Thankappan . . . . .	"	859
12. P.P. Pylee . . . . .	"	861
13. M.K. Kuttappan . . . . .	"	862
14. P.K. Madhavan . . . . .	"	867
15. P.T. Karunan . . . . .	"	870
16. George . . . . .	"	873

*Gang No. 5*

1. C.A. Kochappan . . . . .	Tindal	893
2. T.K. Bhaskaran . . . . .	Winchman	874
3. Kandankoran Gopalan . . . . .	"	853
4. Antony Xavier . . . . .	Gangwayman	2071
5. Kochu Pappan . . . . .	Batha (C)	1045
6. C.P. John . . . . .	"	877
7. K.A. Muhamed . . . . .	"	880
8. K.L. Xavier . . . . .	"	882
9. Krishnan . . . . .	"	814
10. Chavaro . . . . .	"	887
11. E.K. Viswanathan . . . . .	"	890
12. Augustine . . . . .	"	896
13. Poulse . . . . .	"	902
14. K.C. Daniel . . . . .	"	903
15. M.A. Muhamedali . . . . .	"	907
16. K.A. Abdulrahiman . . . . .	"	910

*Gang No. 6*

1. M.W. D'cruz . . . . .	Tindal	1133
2. V.M. Francis . . . . .	Winchman	856
3. Gopalan Balan . . . . .	"	1243
4. C.K. Kesavan . . . . .	Gangwayman	1318
5. Aliyar . . . . .	Batha (C)	914
6. Syed . . . . .	"	917
7. Ebrahim . . . . .	"	920
8. K.A. Kochunny . . . . .	"	921
9. A.P. Augustine . . . . .	"	922
10. George . . . . .	"	923
11. Muhamed . . . . .	"	924
12. Ismail . . . . .	"	925
13. Mamma . . . . .	"	927
14. T.G. Subrahmaniam . . . . .	"	930
15. A.A. Ummer . . . . .	"	931
16. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	932

*Gang No. 7*

1. A.P. Joseph . . . . .	Tindal	879
2. K.M. Anthappan . . . . .	Winchman	900
3. C.A. Pappu . . . . .	"	885
4. P.A. George . . . . .	Gangwayman	848
5. K.V. Raman . . . . .	Batha (C)	933
6. Parameswaran . . . . .	"	934
7. Abdulkhadir . . . . .	"	935
8. A.E. Muhamed . . . . .	"	936
9. P.M. Muhamed . . . . .	"	937
10. Mammali . . . . .	"	940
11. Muhamed . . . . .	"	941
12. Ahamed . . . . .	"	944
13. Abubakar . . . . .	"	943
14. Muhamed . . . . .	"	945
15. K.A. Kassim . . . . .	"	954
16. M.A. Anthappan . . . . .	"	957

*Gang No. 8*

D.L.B. No.

1. Kochunny Mustafa	Tindal	1310
2. N.A. Chellappan	Winchman	397
3. Madhavan Kandankoran	"	2320
4. Bava Kunhanbava	Gangwayman	2242
5. M.K. Abdulrahiman	Batha (C)	961
6. K.E. Kochumyamed	"	974
7. Nuruddin	"	975
8. Jaini	"	976
9. Kalthosc	"	980
10. K.M. Moosa	"	981
11. B. Ebrahin	"	982
12. Ismail	"	985
13. Kumaran	"	999
14. Karappan	"	1000
15. Padmanabhan	"	1002
16. Kunhan Sukumaran	"	1008

*Gang No. 9*

1. P.A. Abdurahman	Tindal	3402
2. Thomman Devassy	Winchman	1212
3. Augustine John	"	1218
4. Karuppan Karumpan	Gangwayman	2083
5. Kumaran	Batha (C)	1014
6. Antony	"	1017
7. P.O. Rockey	"	1018
8. Narayanan	"	1023
9. V.C. Joseph	"	1051
10. Mammi Mamoo	"	1070
11. Makku Khadir	"	1087
12. Makku Abdu	"	1091
13. Kochabdulla Kochumuhamed	"	1104
14. Kunhumohamed Yusuf	"	1105
15. Assianar Bava	"	1110
16. Alikutty Mammad	"	1114

*Gang No. 10*

1. T.P. Kunhali	Tindal	1316
2. Pappi Velayudhan	Winchman	1336
3. Sankaran Karappan	"	1337
4. Madhavan Narayanan	Gangwayman	2192
5. Eramu Abdu	Batha (C)	1115
6. Beervu Majid	"	1127
7. Beervunny Kochulla	"	1148
8. K. Ummer	"	1149
9. V.S. Krishnan	"	1167
10. K.K. Abdulrahiman	"	1173
11. Bassy Devassy	"	1175
12. Lonan Ouso	"	1245
13. Imbichi Bava	"	1264
14. A.K. Kunhumohamed	"	1265
15. Nainamad Muhamed	"	1300
16. Appu Kunhunny	"	1303

*Gang No. 11*

1. K.A. Balakrishnan Nair	Tindal	851
2. K.V. Kochappan	Winchman	2184
3. P.V. Kesavan	"	2191
4. Ayyaru Paraman	Gangwayman	2288
5. Peter Lazar	Batha (C)	1308
6. Kochukutty Chithambaran	"	1322
7. Chavaro Jacob	"	1324
8. N.V. Thomas	"	1326
9. K.J. Antony	"	1352



D.L.B. No.

10.	K.S. George	.	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	1399
11.	M.O. Chacko	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	1402
12.	K.P. Xavier	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	1457
13.	Kesavan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2074
14.	Chandran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2075
15.	T.K. Ayyaru	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2076
16.	T.V. Madhavan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2077

## Gang No. 12

1.	P.K. Karappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1043
2.	P.V. Divakaran	.	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2218
3.	T.K. Kochappayi	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2227
4.	Kochukutty Purushan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1365
5.	Karappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2078
6.	T.V. Ayyaru	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2079
7.	M.C. Kuttappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2080
8.	P.P. Pylee	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2085
9.	K.C. Robert	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2088
10.	P.T. Xavier	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2089
11.	A.X. Joseph	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2090
12.	P.P. Srinivasan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2092
13.	P.R. Thankappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2094
14.	A.M. Manachan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2100
15.	T.K. Govindan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2102
16.	V.K. Rajappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2107

## Gang No. 13

1.	K.M. Kannan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2293
2.	P.P. Ayyappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2274
3.	Sukumaran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2305
4.	P.M. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1107
5.	P.G. Narayanan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2111
6.	M.K. Peethambaran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2109
7.	P.K. Paramu	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2113
8.	S. Sudhan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2115
9.	M.K. Surendran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2117
10.	P.G. Lakshmanan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2118
11.	T.K. Raman	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2122
12.	K.K. Narayanan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2167
13.	P.K. Madhavan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2168
14.	Ayyaru	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2171
15.	Anandan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2172
16.	Kumaran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2173

## Gang No. 14

1.	Krishnan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2304
2.	C.P. Krishnan	.	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2336
3.	Mylan Kunhan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2346
4.	Ailesh Chavaro	.	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	2279
5.	Karunakaran	.	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2174
6.	Kunjayyappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2177
7.	Krishnan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2178
8.	Pylee	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2179
9.	Kochu	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2182
10.	Chandran	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2183
11.	Madhavan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2188
12.	Kunhan Bava	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2189
13.	Thomas	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2195
14.	Devassy	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2196
15.	Kochukutty	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2199
16.	Balappan	.	.	.	.	.	.	"	2201

## Gang No. 15.

D.L.B. No.

1.	Vallon	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2311
2.	V.V. Karunakaran	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2268
3.	Kunjeeran	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2210
4.	Kochon Kumaran	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	2233
5.	Raghavan	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2202
6.	Kochu	.	.	.	.	.	"	2205
7.	Kumaran	.	.	.	.	.	"	2208
8.	Krishnan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2209
9.	Kunjukeeran	.	.	.	.	.	"	2210
10.	Kannan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2213
11.	George	.	.	.	.	.	"	2215
12.	Velayudhan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2216
13.	Raghavan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2219
14.	Kannan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2220
15.	Thevan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2221
16.	Kunjubava	.	.	.	.	.	"	2223

## Gang No. 16.

1.	Kandan	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	2315
2.	T.O. Poulose	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	881
3.	Ouseph Lonan	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2323
4.	Raghuthaman	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	2316
5.	Velappan	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2224
6.	Paramu	.	.	.	.	.	"	2225
7.	Kunhubava	.	.	.	.	.	"	2226
8.	Chothi	.	.	.	.	.	"	2231
9.	Antho	.	.	.	.	.	"	2232
10.	Xavier	.	.	.	.	.	"	2235
11.	George	.	.	.	.	.	"	2236
12.	Meenku	.	.	.	.	.	"	2237
13.	Paramu	.	.	.	.	.	"	2239
14.	Chathan	.	.	.	.	.	"	2244
15.	Paramu	.	.	.	.	.	"	2247
16.	Karunakaran	.	.	.	.	.	"	2249

## Gang No. 17.

1.	V.A. Abdulrahiman	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	947
2.	Ouseph Antony	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	388
3.	Kittan Karunakaran	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2200
4.	K.K. Muhamed	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1098
5.	P.M. Kunhan	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	2310
6.	Michael	.	.	.	.	.	"	899
7.	Karuppan Thathi	.	.	.	.	.	"	2073
8.	Thevan Pappan	.	.	.	.	.	"	892
9.	C.K. Sankunny	.	.	.	.	.	"	849
10.	Kochumohamed	.	.	.	.	.	"	1598
11.	Ummer	.	.	.	.	.	"	1619
12.	Abu	.	.	.	.	.	"	1628
13.	K.A. George	.	.	.	.	.	"	872
14.	Kochu	.	.	.	.	.	"	2250
15.	Chathukutty	.	.	.	.	.	"	2253
16.	Supran	.	.	.	.	.	"	2256

## Gang No. 18.

1.	Hassan Kunhumon	.	.	.	.	.	Tindal	1147
2.	Ayyaru Kodiyan	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2246
3.	Chothi Kunhanbava	.	.	.	.	.	Winchman	2252
4.	P.M. Ali	.	.	.	.	.	Gangwayman	1141
5.	Ebrahim Moideen	.	.	.	.	.	Batha (C)	1388
6.	A. Abdulrahiman	.	.	.	.	.	"	1451
7.	Abdu	.	.	.	.	.	"	1473
8.	Moidu	.	.	.	.	.	"	1480
9.	Abdulla Abu	.	.	.	.	.	"	1483
10.	Ali Bava	.	.	.	.	.	"	1497

Gang No.	18.--contd.	Balha(c)	D.L B. No
11.	Syedu Muhammed	"	1537
12.	Abdurahiman	"	1548
13.	K. Abdullakutty	"	1555
14.	A. Bava	"	1571
15.	Ebrahim	"	1595
16.	M.A. Pareed	"	1596
1.	K.H. Abdulkader	"	1441
2.	Somappan	"	2197
3.	E.P. Xavier	"	124
4.	Vava	"	1004
5.	Chothi Raman	"	2258
6.	Ittiadi	"	2217
7.	Krishnan	"	2259
8.	Kumaran	"	2263
9.	Prabhakara Menon	"	2331

Sd/- M.K. RAGHAVAN.

Sd/- W.H.D. CRUZ.

Sd/- B.K. JAYARAM RAO.

### ANNEXURE C

#### C.P.T.U. (INTUC) General Cargo Gangs

S. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name.
<i>Gang No. 1.</i>			
1.		3080	S.M. Khalid (T)
2.	2522	3058	A. Aboobacker
3.	2487	3088	P.P. Moideenkutty
4.	1922	3335	P.A. Velayudhan
5.	1917	3091	Anthoni Athanas
6.	1967	3177	O.M. Abdulkader
7.	3062	3247	P.M. Moideena
8.	3046	3209	R. Sreenivasan
9.	2506	3085	Kuttyali Mohamed
10.	1927	3082	L.L. Marko
<i>Gang No. 2.</i>			
1.		3238	P.T. Vacko (T)
2.	1870	3200	Moosa Bapputty
3.	2447	3197	T.V. Varghese
4.	2508	3289	C.R. Parameswaran
5.	2353	3182	Pareed Hassainer
6.	1963	3178	K.P. Abdulkader
7.	2528	3181	K.T. Joseph
8.	2336	3316	A.M. Abdul Rahman
9.	2301	3218	George Joseph
10.	1897	3161	K.A. Joseph
<i>Gang No. 3.</i>			
1.		3205	P.K. Unni (T)
2.	2494	3225	C.K. Krishnankutty
3.	1999	3210	Mammoosan Aboobacker
4.	3004	3216	Michael Joseph
5.	2473	3219	P.S. Manuel
6.	2564	3337	C.M. Abdulkader
7.	1973	3211	P.X. Joseph
8.	2316	3162	Vamana Prabhu
9.	2383	3004	Aymulla Mohamed
10.	2357	3212	Augustine Mathappan

Sr. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<i>Gang No. 4.</i>			
1.		3277	P. Ahamedkutty (T)
2.	2393	3001	Amunji Azces
3.	1996	3055	M.M. Yusuff
4.	2445	2557	P.V. Lonan
5.	3008	3338	J. Sebastian
6.	2439	3279	Sivan Subramanian
7.	2986	3274	Mohamed Ummkoya
8.	2938	3101	Mohamedmamu
9.	2476	2543	P.K. Narayanan
10.	1935	3293	P.K. Abdulrahman
<i>Gang No. 5.</i>			
1.	2960	2506	T. K. Ebrahim (T)
2.	2966	3302	K. Kunjurnon
3.	3037	3152	Kader Bava
4.	2343	3010	Augustine Jusai
5.	1953	3052	K. K. Kunjumohamed
6.	2993	3306	Pareed Mohamed
7.	2549	3059	K. Velayudhan
8.	2304	3192	P. G. Joshi
9.	2495	3273	Makkar Mamma
10.	2396	2552	Earnest Montho
<i>Gang No. 6.</i>			
1.		3291	S. R. Xavier (T)
2.	2388	3113	P. T. Mohammed
3.	1898	3123	C. P. Xavier
4.	1908	3147	Kayi Mammoo
5.	2498	3121	Abel Mathew
6.	2340	3116	R. Narayanan
7.	2448	3328	K. A. Yusuff
8.	3018	3295	S. I. Hamced
9.	1980	3276	Francis Kavoo
10.	3027	2723	M. E. Parameswaran
<i>Gang No. 7.</i>			
1.		3104	K. A. Adimakutty
2.	2568	3215	C. P. Joseph
3.	2313	3267	K. Mammoo
4.	1948	3072	K. A. Charlie
5.	2335	2656	K. P. Augustine
6.	2389	3098	St. John Antony
7.	2359	3060	P. P. Joseph
8.	3043	3283	V. Madhavan
9.	2545	2482	P. K. Pareekutty
10.	1965	3340	K. M. Khalid
<i>Gang No. 8.</i>			
1.		3266	B. Hussan (T)
2.	2303	3169	K. S. Mohamed
3.	2450	3230	Raphcal Mathai
4.	2375	3185	P. B. Ebrahim
5.	1980	2410	T. K. Velayudhan
6.	1978	3343	E. Kunjumohamed
7.	1991	3255	K. Kochumohamed
8.	1968	3329	P. P. George
9.	1924	3083	T. K. Mammicha
10.	1913	3145	Moideen Alavi

Sr. No.	ACR No.	D.L.B. No.	Name
<b>Gang No. 9.</b>			
1.		3151	M. K. Cheeku (T)
2.	2497	3006	Parced Uminder
3.	1904	3140	John Peeter
4.	2364	3130	K. Krishnan
5.	2480	3007	A. J. Raphael
6.	1929	3012	Ahamedkutty Abdulkader
7.	2368	3005	G. Krishnan
8.	2192	3063	P. A. Abdulrahman
9.	2337	3003	Kuttanchalil Chouro Iazer
10.	2535	2657	V. X. Lasar

<b>Gang No. 10.</b>			
1.		3339	K. M. Siddique (T)
2.	2979	3276	K. B. Josa
3.	1892	3114	P. A. John
4.	2305	3294	K. Palani
5.	1890	3112	Adima Mohamed
6.	1949	3251	P. J. Joseph
7.	2338	3009	Elayadath Durning Antony
8.	2401	3257	P. V. Paul
9.	2429	3250	Meenku Joseph
10.	2412	3253	Abdurahman Yusuff

<b>Gang No. 11.</b>			
1.	2962	3248	K. M. Essa (T)
2.	1925	3081	M. Aboobacker
3.	2398	3094	M. R. Joseph
4.	2341	3163	A. Hydross
5.	2308	3235	K. K. Joseph
6.	1896	3298	Mammu Mohamed
7.	2540	3301	Mayankutty Hussan
8.	2470	3067	Varechan Thummil
9.	2312	3220	K. A. Aboobacker
10.	2313	3156	K. M. Ilamza

<b>Gang No. 12.</b>			
1.		3208	N. A. Kunjalavi
2.	2400	3016	K. A. Peter
3.	2507	2497	V. V. Peter
4.	2567	3264	A. K. Achappan
5.	2464	3311	L. L. Xavier
6.	3001	3314	Amoo Mohamed
7.	2456	3263	P. E. Vakachan
8.	2451	3262	V. O. Sankun
9.	2970	2894	A. A. Yusuf
10.	2457	3265	Kunjali Khalid

<b>Gang No. 13.</b>			
1.	2408	3125	K. S. Antony (T)
2.	1943	2658	P. M. Parced
3.	2391	3107	K. K. Gocl
4.	1918	3086	B. Kunju Mohammed
5.	2413	3108	P. J. Devassy
6.	2521	3190	Augustine Thomas
7.	2574	3131	Adima Beeran
8.	2560	3028	Meeran Moideen
9.	2315	3128	Kunjaimu Beeran
10.	3030	3002	Bavakunji Ebrahimkutty

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<i>Gang No. 14</i>			
1.	2959	3240	Ahar Hameed (T)
2.	2438	3064	V. P. Padmanabha Pillai
3.	2502	3095	Kunjikar Ebrahim
4.	2345	3073	Vincent John
5.	2436	3074	K. A. Antony
6.	3066	3077	K. Lakshmanan
7.	2432	3066	K. V. Chandran
8.	1972	3179	V. K. Abdulkader
9.	2527	3071	N. X. Marnaloose
10.	2427	3075	Ayamu Mohamed

*Gang No. 15*

1.		3135	T. Francis Rodrique (T)
2.	1915	3144	P. A. Kasim
3.	2471	3149	V. Krishnan
4.	1912	3148	Devassy Anthappan
5.	1942	3199	A. A. Moossa
6.	1902	3134	Chacko Jacob
7.	2346	3165	K. T. Vackachan
8.	1908	3138	Allesh Joshi
9.	1971	3254	K. K. Yusuff
10.	2536	3142	K. A. Sulaiman

*Gang No. 16*

1.		3015	K. M. Abdhu (T)
2.	2381	3106	K. M. Narayanan
3.	1974	3011	Antony Lasar
4.	2455	3217	P. J. Vincent
5.	1995	3115	K. Abdulkader
6.	3053	3039	N. Krishnan
7.	2505	3038	V. J. Mathew
8.	2357	3153	Ayyan Kantan Koran
9.	2510	3037	K. Ali Bava
10.	2555	3034	K. A. Ismail

*Gang No. 17*

1.		3261	Ali Moidu (T)
2.	2957	3467	P.P. Yusuff
3.	2305	3327	P. T. Joseph
4.	3020	3241	T. K. Karunakaran
5.	2552	3321	Mohamed Hussan
6.	2469	3222	K. Abdulla
7.	2464	3223	P. Hydross
8.	3054	3324	S. Govindan
9.	2523	3243	A. Hamza
10.	2416	3132	P. A. Thomas

*Gang No. 18*

1.		3237	Konnan Kumaran (T)
2.	2517	3030	V. R. Narayanan (G)
3.	2512	3031	N. B. Mohamedali
4.	2550	3025	P. I. Joshi
5.	3063	3027	V. Lakshmanan
6.	2503	3020	A. Aboobacker (A.A.)
7.	3058	3024	T. K. Lakshmanan
8.	2991	3022	Mammoo Abdhu
9.	2561	2412	Mohammed Hussan
10.	2509	3021	T. A. Aboo

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
------------	------------	------------	------

*Gang No. 19*

1.		2729	Mayan Mohammed (T)
2.	1901	3700	P. M. Sulaiman (G)
3.	2325	3172	Ali Mohammed
4.	1939	3170	K. T. Charlie
5.	1940	3176	P. A. Varghese
6.	2405	3117	A. X. Stanly
7.	2992	3171	P. A. Abdulrahiman
8.	2551	2972	M. A. Alikutty
9.	1932	3385	M. J. Xavier
10.	2452	3320	K. M. Moosa

*Gang No. 20*

1.		3188	Mohammed Kuruakkal (T)
2.	1931	2730	T. S. Mohamed (G)
3.	2414	3109	V. S. Varghese
4.	1964	3183	Parced Mohammed
5.	1955	3249	T. A. Kunjumohamed
6.	2194	3214	K. O. Antony
7.	2478	3239	G. K. Kamath
8.	2300	3231	K. J. Devassy
9.	2900	3319	V. S. Palaniyandi
10.	3051	3032	K. Anandan

*Gang No. 21*

1.		3164	M. A. Pareekutty (T)
2.	2390	3023	P. V. John (G)
3.	2403	3137	K. G. Antony
4.	3039	3120	R. Lakshmanan
5.	3019	3118	K. A. Joseph
6.	1667	3198	A. A. Mohamed
7.	3021	3119	K. M. Enthu
8.	2376	3168	P. A. Mohammedali
9.	1693	2408	P. Kunjan
10.	2370	3122	P. O. George

*Gang No. 22*

1.		3259	E. L. Francis (T)
2.	2323	3252	C. A. Bava (G)
3.	1899	2722	Moidheen Bava Hamza
4.	1984	3275	M. Francis
5.	1923	3084	Bava Abdulrahiman
6.	2307	3236	Mohamed Bava
7.	2369	3201	K. Ebrahim
8.	1895	3233	Saumon Joseph
9.	1914	3303	Sebastian D'Silva
10.	2404	3035	A. Abdulrehman

*Gang No. 23*

1.		3041	K. M. Syed (T)
2.	1905	3044	P. K. Ebrahim (G)
3.	2384	2489	M. C. Peter
4.	2418	3047	C. C. Michael
5.	2442	3043	Parced Ahamkutty
6.	2386	3159	P. K. Mammo
7.	1887	3124	C. V. Lourance
8.	2395	3285	P. M. Syed
9.	2344	3008	Antoney Augustine
10.	3031	3281	C. V. Kakki

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<i>Gang No. 24</i>			
1.		3232	K. A. Bavakutty (T)
2.	1976	3111	K. Aboo (G)
3.	3022	3157	T. M. Aboobacker
4.	2546	3282	C. S. Velayudhan
5.	2423	3127	T. K. Kader
6.	2558	3029	P. C. Danial
7.	2441	3049	C. K. Kasim
8.	2526	3269	R. Kuttappan
9.	2339	3386	P. M. Alukoya
10.	1947	3158	Antoney Pishi

*Gang No. 25*

1.	1993	3187	R. Govindan (T)
2.	56	2827	P. M. Ummer (G)
3.	1926	3347	P. K. Ali
4.	2428	3076	Beeran Mohammed
5.	2711	3062	Raman Velayudhan
6.	2474	3256	P. O. Antony
7.	2380	3102	K. A. Mohammed
8.	2444	2411	Mohammed Pared
9.	1936	3336	O. S. Ummer
10.	2033	3300	T. K. Bharathan

*Gang No. 26*

1.		2717	K. M. Ebrahim (T)
2.	2319	3258	K. J. Peter (G)
3.	2382	3299	Varkey Josa
4.	1961	3204	Burnow Joseph
5.	2327	3087	Devassy Chourow
6.	2515	3053	K. C. Joseph
7.	1934	3173	V. K. Ousow
8.	2477	3160	P. A. Alikunju
9.	2342	2549	C. O. Oshi
10.	2547	3322	B. Sreenivasan

*Gang No. 27*

1.		3193	P. K. Pareekutty (T)
2.	1962	3089	M. Bajee (G)
3.	2365	3390	Modhu Moidhunn
4.	1894	3026	P. P. Mohammed
5.	2499	3317	M. A. Gopalan
6.	1906	3206	A. T. Scaser
7.	2374	3096	M. M. Hassan
8.	1935	3051	A. Abdulrehiman
9.	1985	3342	E. L. Antoney
10.	2318	3054	K. K. Kochunn

## GENERAL CARGO C.P.T.U. (INTUC) WEEENCHMEN

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Names
1.		3065	E. K. Dasan
2.		3033	P. M. Yousuff
3.		3228	Mohammed Abdulla
4.		3155	Vandi Chathan
5.	1952	3166	M. Abdulrahman
6.		3134	Antony Nicklow



Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
7.		3105	Pappu Gerome
8.		3268	T. T. Vincent
9.		3103	P. H. Moldeenkutty
10.		3344	T. A. Joseph
11.	2577	2572	C. A. Mohammedali
12.		3189	K. K. Pareed
13.		2653	Gouri Achambi
14.		3014	Loni Antony
15.		3017	R. M. Mohammedkunju
16.	2496	2671	N. B. Aboo
17.		3234	Joseph Vinamsi
18.	3035	3288	V. Prabhakaran
19.		3323	P. A. Francis
20.	2491	3292	A. L. Bastian
21.		3079	P. M. Aboo
22.		3195	Joseph Antony
23.		3186	K. A. Aboo
24.		2576	Abdulla Ummer
25.		3227	P. P. Mohammedkutty
26.	2470	3154	Vacko Joseph
27.		3194	Thomas Sandhyavu
28.	2355	3042	T. M. Ismail
29.	2378	3333	Bava Lorange
30.	2000	3245	E. J. Joseph
31.	2530	3061	K. M. Abdurrahiman
32.	2460	3226	V. B. Bastian
33.	1957	3050	A. B. Kasim
34.	2525	3297	K. P. Ousephkutty
35.	2434	3070	Joseph Varghese
36.	1998	3207	Kesava Pai
37.	2480	3191	K. Abdulkader
38.	2371	3390	Mohamed Pareed
39.	2482	3196	T. L. Joseph

## COCHIN PORT THOZHILALI UNION (INTUC)

## BULK CARGO GANGS

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
---------	---------	---------	------

## Gang No. 1

1.		2417	Allesh Mathai (T)
2.	3091	2443	P. O. Xavier
3.	2668	2428	K. T. Raphael
4.	3105	2596	C. K. Kannan
5.	2911	2438	P. K. Srikandan
6.	2387	2429	M. G. Xavier
7.	2718	2478	V. U. Madhavan
8.	2914	2648	Ayyappan Damodaran
9.	2675	2445	Vacko Vareed
10.	2643	2435	K. L. Joseph
11.	2667	2433	Devassy Anthappan
12.	2672	3355	Chouri Xavier
13.	2710	2477	V. C. Kochappan
14.	2583	2641	P. T. John

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<i>Gang No. 2.</i>			
1.		2630	T. C. Madhavan (T)
2.	2700	2487	Thevan Narayanan
3.	2664	2484	Thevan Thatan
4.	2662	2562	K. P. Thankapan
5.	2875	2696	K. K. Peethambaran
6.	2678	2520	Chatan Cheeran
7.	2612	2597	K. D. Maichel
8.	2764	2529	Itiyathi Thevan
9.	2663	2521	Karoor Ayyappan
10.	2615	2634	Cheetha Kumaran
11.	2772	2636	M. A. Gangadharan
12.	2736	2566	Kandankoran Ayyankutty
13.	2761	2519	K. R. George
14.	3080	2541	Kochupilla Narayanan
<i>Gang No. 3.</i>			
1.		2433	P. V. George (T)
2.	2715	2465	A. A. Gangadharan
3.	2706	2466	V. U. Balakrishnan
4.	2709	2620	Velu Mohan
5.	2569	2710	T. K. Krishnan
6.	2704	2467	A. K. Raman
7.	2713	2469	T. A. Narayanan
8.	2717	2480	B. A. Kochavan
9.	2708	2471	B. K. Parameshwaran
10.	2719	2472	Ittikomari Damodaran
11.	2712	2473	A. K. Sankaran
12.	2637	3372	Ayyappan Damodaran
13.	2582	2474	K. A. Kumaran
14.	2788	3378	Allesh Antony
<i>Gang No. 4.</i>			
1.	2925	2539	M. Abdulkader (T)
2.	2648	2528	C. K. Karunan
3.	2690	2449	Velu Narayanan
4.	2779	2452	K. A. Antony
5.	2740	2730	K. A. Kunjathan
6.	2903	2456	Poovankunjan
7.	2699	2458	Kodiyankunjappan
8.	2685	2450	Kannan Devan
9.	2725	2612	Appachan Krishnan
10.	2683	2422	Sheetha Unni
11.	3100	2509	Mylan Kumaran
12.	2684	2635	Chothi Velayudhan
13.	2640	2454	K. K. Kunjan Bava
14.	2614	2403	T. D. Chacki
<i>Gang No. 5.</i>			
1.		3363	M. K. Kannan (T)
2.	2629	3368	Chouri Allesh
3.	2781	2431	C. V. Chendamarakshan
4.	2631	3370	P. D. Joseph
5.	2580	3373	E. C. Cheekku
6.	2609	3384	P. K. Antony
7.	2633	3397	Chacko Joseph
8.	2544	3374	T. K. Francis
9.	2630	3376	Mathai Allesh
10.	2635	3371	T. P. Varghese
11.	2638	3377	Kochilan Arjunan
12.	2799	3381	Vareed Vacko
13.	2903	2476	A. C. Kumarankutty
14.	2707	2475	Kochappan Velu

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Nam
<i>Gang No. 6.</i>			
1.		2488	Abraham Salmon (T)
2.	2920	2500	K. B. Joseph
3.	2626	2932	Krishnan Raghavan
4.	3086	2563	Thevan Karunan
5.	2734	2495	Valavan Kocho
6.	2731	2574	Thevan Valutha
7.	3074	2567	Sankaran Narayanan
8.	2650	2510	Anandan Gangadharen
9.	2733	2491	Kuruppan Ayyappan
10.	2697	2586	Theyan Kandan
11.	2765	2693	Kandankoran Kochu Bava
12.	2665	2524	Thevan Maran
13.	2730	2613	Kandan Kumaran
14.	3077	2702	Kunjan Madhavan
<i>Gang No. 7.</i>			
1.		2550	O. G. Thummi(T)
2.	3087	2688	V.V. Purushan
3.	3003	2568	K. P. Thomas
4.	2915	2640	A.A. Aravindan
5.	3089	2502	P. O. George
6.	2800	2645	Ayyappan Velayudhan
7.	2909	2646	P. C. Chandran
8.		2712	K. X. Varghese
9.	2721	2559	P. K. Viswambaran
10.	2981	2661	M. C. Cheetha
11.	3081	2579	O. K. Virundhan
12.	2795	2676	K. K. Mohanan
13.	2786	2649	A. K. Bava
14.	2790	2580	C. D. Vacko
<i>Gang No. 8.</i>			
1.		2691	Kannan Gopalan (T)
2.	2682	2650	V. T. Xavier
3.	2763	3396	K. C. Bavachan
4.	2619	2531	Anandan Thevan
5.	2921	2609	N.K. Subramaniayan
6.	3767	2405	K. T. Pailee
7.	2559	2404	K. K. Purushan
8.	2672	3394	V.V. George
9.	2703	2483	Thevan Raghavan
10.	2610	2406	Ali Mohammed Kochurri
11.	3069	2490	Sanku Raman
12.	3078	2460	A. C. Pappu
13.	3079	2546	Konnann Subramaniyan
14.	2551	2428	Mohamedali
<i>Gang No. 9.</i>			
1.	2926	2615	V. K. Sivaraman (T)
2.	2913	2622	Joseph John
3.	2594	2626	Kakan Vallon
4.	2679	2629	K. C. George
5.	2636	2621	T. K. Kamalakshan
6.	3014	2508	P. K. Varudukutty
7.	2593	2628	Kodiyan Kandari
8.	2595	2624	Kochilan Chothi
9.	2670	2632	M. J. Paul
10.	2666	2619	Vardu Kunjappan
11.	2715	2618	P. A. Subran
12.	2603	3369	O. V. Joseph
13.	2907	2625	K. K. Velayudhan
14.	2687	2627	Avarachan Joseph

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<b>Gang No. 10.</b>			
1.	2924	2498	A. K. Kannan (T)
2.	2919	2575	N. P. Raphel
3.	2918	3395	S. Purushothaman
4.	2646	2499	Augustine Joseph
5.	2658	2594	K. K. Purushothaman
6.	2284	2558	Ayyappan Paramu
7.	2625	2492	Ayyappan Kunjan
8.	2627	2540	K. K. Sreedharan
9.	2922	2486	Thevan Velutha
10.	3072	2651	Chathan Vallon
11.	2683	2600	Kunjan Chothi
12.	2616	2551	Charithan Appu
13.	2691	2584	Kannanji Cheeran
14.	2741	2547	Thanjan Chellappan
<b>Gang No. 11.</b>			
1.	2676	2427	K. E. Xavier
2.	3082	2659	Bava Karthikeyan
3.	2714	2470	T. K. Krishnan
4.	2755	3354	M. L. Pappachan
5.	2798	2679	P. K. Balakrishnan
6.	2760	2678	Cheeku Mathew
7.	2641	2554	P. P. Jaicob
8.	2579	3375	T. R. Paul
9.	2424	2527	Varceed Enashi
10.	2902	2642	K. M. Joseph
11.	2605	3353	O. V. Bhavachan
12.	3010	3362	Kannan Kunjan
13.	2601	2459	K. X. Joseph
14.	2602	2647	C. G. Jeraso
<b>Gang No. 12.</b>			
1.	2928	2485	T. K. Ayyan (T)
2.	2691	2421	Unni Karuppan
3.	3076	2451	Ishnathi Kochukutty
4.	2682	2424	K. C. Chandran
5.	2656	2426	K. R. Chauru
6.	3098	2606	Anandan Prabhakaran
7.	2652	2425	Chathan Kumaran
8.	2779	2604	Kunjan Kunjappan
9.	2655	2607	K. T. Kochukutty
10.	3070	2611	K. K. Kumaran
11.	3075	2415	Bappu George
12.	2793	2468	Kochappi Karuppan
13.	2592	2441	Thevan Bavachan
14.	2686	2448	C. K. Sivarajan
<b>Gang No. 13.</b>			
1.	2965	3348	A. R. Joesph (T)
2.	2750	2442	Kandan Achuthan
3.	2741	3366	V. C. Raghavan
4.	2581	3363	P. A. George
5.	2758	3361	Varudu Augustine
6.	2745	3360	Rahunni Theyo
7.	2752	3358	Ouseph Ouseph
8.	2753	3352	Ouseph Josa
9.	2747	3359	Kunjan Kandari
10.	2676	2439	Loni Joseph
11.	2604	3356	A. K. Padmanabhan
12.	3399	2401	Ayyappan Maniyan
13.	2669	2436	Augustine Ouseph
14.	68	2517	V. D. George

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
<i>Gang No. 14.</i>			
1.	2727	2493	A. J. Xavier (T)
2.	2692	2414	P. M. Kumaran
3.	2649	2603	Kori Karumban
4.	2631	2682	V. D. Joseph
5.	2623	2695	K. A. George
6.	2694	2455	Ayyappan Thevan
7.	2767	2675	Kochu Sankaran
8.	2687	2453	Kandankoran Bhaskaran
9.	2622	3068	M. X. Mathew
10.	2659	2545	Lazar Chouri
11.	2735	2908	K. Ayyappan
12.	2724	2614	P. M. Raghavan
13.	3101	2637	Unni Subramaniayan
14.	3094	2605	K. L. Thomas

*Gang No. 15.*

1.		2444	C.K. Achuthan (T)
2.	2910	2735	K.A. Kochappan
3.	2608	2689	Velu Aravindakshan
4.	2530	2430	K. P. Vareedkutty
5.	2783	2582	P. O. Devassy
6.	2607	2677	P.K. Sukumaran
7.	3096	2734	C. K. Narayanan
8.	2598	2479	P. K. Kochappan
9.	3092	2515	O. X. Joseph
10.	2785	2968	P. X. Antho
11.	2758	2583	P. V. Xavier
12.	2794	2560	Ouseph Antony
13.	3090	2516	K. M. John
14.	3050	2660	P.K. Subran

*Gang No. 16.*

1.		2501	T. K. Sreedharan (T)
2.	2906	2569	Allesh Mathai
3.	2543	3380	A. A. Stephen
4.	3103	2526	A.K. Vallen
5.	3091	2564	T. O. Xavier
6.	2720	2725	Kunjan Chetappan
7.	3097	2639	Vareed Augustine
8.	2696	2432	M.K. Sankaran
9.	3104	2718	Kunjan Ayyappan
10.	2797	2967	M.M. Eashi
11.	2904	2570	Joseph Cheeku
12.	3093	2581	K. T. Joseph
13.	2908	2623	Velu Kandankoran
14.	2632	3379	P. J. Manual

BULK CARGO—C.P.T.U. (INTUC)  
WINCH DRIVERS

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
1.		3392	M. K. Madhavan
2.	2934	2481	Ouseph Thomas
3.	2966	2592	Abraham Kuriyan
4.	2624	2461	K. K. Kochappan
5.	2929	2464	Velu Narayanan

Sl. No.	ACR No.	DLB No.	Name
6.	2927	2631	Ouseph Devassy
7.	2967	2494	Gopalan Purushan
8.	2618	2496	Kochukutty Pappu
9.	2542	3383	V. J. Enashi
10.	2932	2434	Joseph John
11.	2726	2601	P. P. Pallee
12.		2402	A.R. Bashi
13.	2931	2643	A.A. Raphael
14.		3367	Kumaran Damodaran
15.	2723	2602	Valavan Krishnan
16.		2685	Unnira Velayudhan
17.	2935	2633	Allesh Joseph
18.	2742	3351	P. K. Bavachan
19.	2777	2447	Neelan Madhavan
20.	2738	2791	K. R. Raghavan
21.	2590	2638	Chathan Bhavachan
22.	2628	2418	P. J. Chandi
23.	2776	2577	A. B. Joseph
24.	2729	2457	Kuruppan Kannan
25.	2930	3350	Kunjan Kumaran
26.	2933	3349	Varceed Joseph
27.	2728	2523	Kochukaruppan
28.	3086	2591	C. K. Sukumaran
29.	2691	2616	Bava Kochubava
30.	2705	2644	P. K. Ambukakshan
31.	2576	2608	P. X. Thomas
32.	2613	2692	C. C. Gopalan.

Sd/- G. S. DHARA SINGH

[28/12/61-LR.IV.]

G. JAGANNATHAN, Under Secy.